arXiv:1511.02048v1 [math.CO] 6 Nov 2015

THE CORE IN RANDOM HYPERGRAPHS AND LOCAL WEAK CONVERGENCE

KATHRIN SKUBCH*

Abstract. The degree of a vertex in a hypergraph is defined as the number of edges incident to it. In this paper we study the k-core, defined as the maximal induced subhypergraph of minimum degree k, of the random r-uniform hypergraph $\boldsymbol{H}_r(n,p)$ for $r \geq 3$. We consider the case $k \geq 2$ and $p = d/n^{r-1}$ for which every vertex has fixed average degree $d > 0$. We derive a multi-type branching process that describes the local structure of the k-core together with the mantle, i.e. the vertices outside the core.

Mathematics Subject Classification: 05C80, 05C65 (primary), 05C15 (secondary)

Key words: Random hypergraphs, core, branching process, Warning Propagation

1. Introduction

Let $r \geq 3$ and let $d > 0$ be a fixed constant. We denote by $\boldsymbol{H} = \boldsymbol{H}_r(n, d/n^{r-1})$ the random r-uniform hypergraph on the vertex set $[n] = \{1, \ldots, n\}$ in which any subset a of $[n]$ of cardinality r forms an edge with probability $p = d/n^{r-1}$ independently. We say that the random hypergraph $\boldsymbol{H}$ enjoys a property with high probability ('w.h.p.') if the probability of this event tends to 1 as n tends to infinity.

1.1. **Background and motivation.** Since the notion of random graphs was first introduced by Erdős and Rényi, many striking results in this area were achieved. One important theme is the emergence of the giant component in this model [7, 17]. In their seminal paper from 1960 [15] Erdős and Rényi proved that the structure of the sparse random graph $\boldsymbol{G}(n,p)$ with $p = d/n$ suddenly changes. If $d < 1 - \varepsilon$ all connected components in this model are of small size w.h.p., whereas if $d > 1 + \varepsilon$ there is a single giant component of linear size. The proof of this phase transition is by means of branching processes. A key observation is that the limit of the normalized size of the giant component coincides with the survival probability of a certain Galton Watson process, [18]. Though this Galton Watson tree is the limit of the "local structure" of the sparse random graph, this branching process approach allows to describe a structure of linear size in the graph.

By now, there is a considerable body of work on the component structure in the generalization of the Binomial random graph model to hypergraphs. In [27] Schmidt-Pruzan and Shamir proved a threshold phenomenon similar to the one in [15] for the random r-uniform hypergraph with $r \geq 3$. Furthermore, Behrisch, Coja-Oghlan and Kang presented a probabilistic approach to determine a local limit

*Goethe University, Mathematics Institute, 10 Robert Mayer St, Frankfurt 60325, Germany, skubch@math.uni-frankfurt.de.

theorem for the number of vertices in the largest component of the sparse random hypergraph, [4, 5].

One possible way to extend the notion of connected components is to consider subgraphs or subhypergraphs of some given minimal degree. Along these lines the k-core of a graph is defined as the maximal induced subgraph of minimal degree k. In the notion of hypergraphs the degree of a vertex is defined as the number of edges incident to it. Using this definition the k-core of a hypergraph is defined analogously. The k-core of a graph or hypergraph is unique because the union of two subgraphs or subhypergraphs with minimal degree k again has minimal degree k. If there is a vertex of degree strictly less than k, removing this vertex and the edges incident to it will not change the k-core. Therefore, the k-core is obtained by repeatedly removing edges incident to vertices of degree less than k from the graph or hypergraph. The k-core problem in random graphs has attracted a great deal of attention. The 2-core of a graph is nonempty iff the graph contains a cycle. In $\boldsymbol{G}(n, d/n)$ it is well known that a cycle of linear size appears with nonnegative probability for every $d > 1$. For any $k \geq 3$ the k-core of $\boldsymbol{G}(n, d/n)$ behaves quite differently. In [25] Pittel, Spencer and Wormald proved that for any $k \geq 3$ the property of having a extensive k-core has a sharp threshold and determined the precise value below which the k-core of the sparse random graph is empty w.h.p.. In the preliminaries they provided a short heuristic argument to predict this threshold. This argument has been used to provide shorter proofs of their result [22, 26]. Some structural results on the local structure of the k-core follow from either the study of the peeling process [12, 16, 19] or the branching process heuristic [13, 26, 10].

Cores in random hypergraphs, where edges consists of $r \geq 3$ vertices, are of further interest because they play an important role in the study of random constraint satisfaction problems, [2, 20, 24]. The k-core in particular has application to the XORSAT-problem. An instance of XORSAT is a system of boolean linear equations, each involving $r \geq 3$ out of n possible variables. Such system of linear equations naturally corresponds to a hypergraph by including a vertex for every variable and putting an edge on r vertices whenever the corresponding variables form an equation. In this setting the 2-core of the resulting hypergraph is of particular interest. If there is a variable which is contained in at most one equation one can delete both, variable and equation, and the resulting linear system is solvable iff the original system is. This process of deleting variables and equations is equivalent to the peeling process described above, i.e. it reduces the underlying hypergraph to its 2-core. Therefore, the original instance of XORSAT is solvable iff the system of linear equations restricted to the 2-core is solvable.

Motivated by this fact many authors studied the k-core problem in r-uniform hypergraphs for $r \geq 3$. The heuristic argument from [25] has been extended by Molloy to determine the threshold $d_{r,k}$ for the appearance of an extensive k-core in the sparse random hypergraph $\boldsymbol{H}$. To state his result we denote by $\mathcal{C}_k(H)$ the set of vertices in the k-core of a hypergraph H. Then Molloy proved that for any $r \geq 3$ and $k \geq 2$ there is a function $\psi_{r,k} : (0, \infty) \to [0, 1]$ such that for any $d \in (0, \infty) \setminus \{d_{r,k}\}$ the sequence $(n^{-1}|\mathcal{C}_k(\boldsymbol{H})|)_n$ converges to $\psi_{r,k}(d)$ in probability. The function $\psi_{r,k}$ is identical to 0 for all $d < d_{r,k}$ and strictly positive for $d > d_{r,k}$. That is, if $d < d_{r,k}$ the k-core of $\boldsymbol{H}$ is empty w.h.p., whereas if $d > d_{r,k}$ the k-core of $\boldsymbol{H}$ contains a linear number of vertices. Throughout the paper we will refer to the number $|\mathcal{C}_k(H)|$ of vertices in the k-core as the size of the k-core. Beside [22]

there are several different approaches to determine this threshold by studying the peeling process similar to the one in the paper by Pittel, Spencer and Wormald [10, 12, 16, 19]. In [9] Botelho, Wormald an Ziviani proved that this threshold remains the same if the model is restricted to r-partite r-uniform hypergraphs. In [14] Montanari and Dembo determined the fluctuation in the size of the k-core near the threshold $d_{r,k}$. Furthermore, they determined the probability that $\boldsymbol{H}$ has a nonempty k-core as d approaches $d_{r,k}$. Some results on the k-core problem in random hypergraphs follow from the study of random constraint satisfaction problems. In [2] Molloy and Achlioptas studied the peeling process that gives the k-core and proved that every vertex that is not in the k-core can be removed by a sequence of at most $O(\log n)$ steps of the peeling process. The Poisson-Cloning model [19] enables to describe the local structure of the k-core by a simple Galton Watson process. In [12] Cooper studied the k-core of random hypergraphs with some given degree sequence and bounded maximal degree. Cooper derived the asymptotic distribution of vertices with a given number of neighbours in the k-core and in the mantle.

The aim of the present paper is to describe the connections between the vertices in the core and in the mantle. More precisely, our aim is to determine the following distribution. Fix $r \geq 3$, $k \geq 2$, $d > d_{r,k}$. Generate a random hypergraph $\boldsymbol{H}$. Now, apply the peeling process that identifies the k-core of $\boldsymbol{H}$ and colour each vertex that belongs to the k-core black and all other vertices white. Finally, pick a vertex $\boldsymbol{v}$ uniformly at random. What is the distribution of the *coloured* subhypergraph induced on the set of all vertices up to some constant distance from $\boldsymbol{v}$?

For simplicity we adopt the factor graph notion similar as in [21] to give an representation of hypergraphs as bipartite graphs where the two types of nodes represent vertices and edges of a given hypergraph. In this framework we will introduce a branching process that generalizes the usual Galton Watson convergence of the sparse random graph to hypergraphs. This process is the limiting object of the local structure of the random hypergraph. The appropriate formalism to state this result is the notion of local weak convergence, [3, 6, 8]. To complement this process that describes the local structure of the random hypergraph with colors that indicate the membership of the k-core we will characterize the k-core by means of a message passing algorithm, called Warning Propagation. Just as cores, message passing algorithms are an important tool in the study of random constraint satisfaction problems, particularly in the context of the study of the "solution space" [1, 21, 23]. The characterization of the k-core by Warning Propagation was first suggested in the physics literature, [21, Chapter 18]. Warning Propagation introduces directed messages between the two types of nodes in the factor graph. These messages are again of two distinguishable types; messages from vertices to edges and messages in the opposite direction.

In a recent paper we used this characterization in a simpler setting to the k-core problem in sparse random graphs, [11]. The essential difference in the graph case is that there is no exchange of information between vertices and edges in the graph. This is illustrated in the fact that there is only one type of messages in that case. Therefore, it is not necessary to introduce the factor graph notion for graphs to describe such communication. Although we adopt some ideas from [11] the analysis of Warning Propagation in the hypergraph setting appears to be significantly more difficult. In the hypergraph case, the fact that the Warning Propagation description

needs two distinct types of nodes and messages is expressed in the two phases of the branching process in our main result, see Theorem 1.1, Figure 1 and Figure 2.

In [23, proof of Lemma 6] Molloy considers a deletion process on the random hypergraph which corresponds to the Warning Propagation description of the k-core. His analysis to determine the k-core threshold leads him to the study of a limit similar as in Lemma 3.2. A key technical ingredient of the present paper is to additionally make a connection between Warning Propagation and the fixed point problem from § 2.3. This connection is essential to combine Warning Propagation with the local weak convergence result in order to exhibit a branching process that describes the k-core together with the mantle.

1.2. **Results.** To state our main result it will be convenient to use an elegant representation of hypergraphs as factor graphs. A factor graph $F = (\mathcal{V}(F), \mathcal{F}(F), \mathcal{E}(F))$ is a bipartite graph on the parts $\mathcal{V}(F)$ and $\mathcal{F}(F)$. We will refer to $\mathcal{V}(F)$ as the variable nodes of F and to $\mathcal{F}(F)$ as the factor nodes of F. We begin with introducing various standard notions for graphs which carry over to the bipartite factor graphs. In this paper all graphs are assumed to be locally finite with a countable vertex set. Given a vertex v in a graph G we denote by $\partial_G v$ the set of vertices that are adjacent to v in G. We omit G whenever G is clear from the context. By a rooted graph (G, v_0) we mean a graph G together with a distinguished vertex v_0, the root. If $\mathcal{X}$ is a finite set then a $\mathcal{X}$-marked graph (G, v_0, σ) is a rooted graph together with a map $\sigma : V(G) \to \mathcal{X}$. A bijection $\pi : V(G) \to V(G')$ is called isomorphism if every edge in G is mapped to an edge in G'. Two rooted $\mathcal{X}$-marked graphs (G, v_0, σ) and (G', v_0', σ') are called isomorphic if there is an isomorphism π such that $\pi(v_0) = v_0'$ and $\sigma = \sigma' \circ \pi$. We denote by $[G, v_0, \sigma]$ the isomorphism class of (G, v_0, σ) and let $\mathcal{G}^{\mathcal{X}}$ be the set of all isomorphism classes of $\mathcal{X}$-marked graphs. Finally, for $s \geq 0$ let $\partial^s[G, v_0, \sigma]$ signify the isomorphism class of the rooted $\mathcal{X}$-marked graph obtained by deleting all vertices at a distance greater than s from v.

In the special case of factor graphs we will require that the root of a rooted factor graph is a variable node, i.e. $v_0 \in \mathcal{V}(F)$. Similarly, we denote by a $\mathcal{X}$-marked factor graph a rooted factor graph together with a map $\sigma : \mathcal{V}(F) \cup \mathcal{F}(F) \to \mathcal{X}$. The restriction that $v_0 \in \mathcal{V}(F)$ immediately implies that if two rooted factor graphs (F, v_0, σ) and (F', v_0', σ') are isomorphic and if $\pi : \mathcal{V}(F) \cup \mathcal{F}(F) \to \mathcal{V}(F') \cup \mathcal{F}(F')$ is an isomorphism of F and F' then $\pi(\mathcal{V}(F)) = \mathcal{V}(F')$ and $\pi(\mathcal{F}(F)) = \mathcal{F}(F')$. We denote by $\mathcal{F}^{\mathcal{X}}$ the set of all isomorphism classes of $\mathcal{X}$-marked factor graphs.

To represent a given hypergraph H as a factor graph F_H, we let $\mathcal{V}(F_H)$ be the set of vertices in H and $\mathcal{F}(F_H)$ be the set of edges in H. For every variable node $v \in \mathcal{V}(F_H)$ and factor node $a \in \mathcal{F}(F_H)$ we place an edge in F_H iff a is an edge in H incident to v. Then $\partial_{F_H} a$ is nothing but the set of vertices v in H that forms the edge a and $\partial_{F_H} v$ is the set of edges incident to v. Resembling the terminology for hypergraphs, we call a factor graph F r-uniform, if all factor nodes $a \in \mathcal{F}(F)$ have degree r in F, i.e. $|\partial_F a| = r$.

Our aim is to study the random r-uniform hypergraph together with the marking that indicates the membership of vertices of the k-core of $\boldsymbol{H}$. Therefore, we introduce the notion of k-core for r-uniform factor graphs. Similar as for hypergraphs we will describe the k-core of a r-uniform factor graph as the subgraph that remains when we repeatedly remove factor nodes incident to at least one variable node of degree strictly less than k. We denote by $\mathcal{C}_k(F)$ the set of variable nodes in the k-core of F. By the peeling process description it is easy to see that a factor node is

in the k-core of F iff all its neighbours are in the k-core of F. Therefore, the k-core of F coincides with the maximal induced subgraph of F such that each variable node v has minimal degree k and each factor node has degree precisely r. If we are given a hypergraph H the peeling process above is analogous to the one described in § 1.1, i.e. a vertex of a hypergraph H is in the k-core of H iff the corresponding variable node is in the k-core of F_H. Furthermore, let $\sigma_{k,F} : \mathcal{V}(F) \cup \mathcal{F}(F) \to \{0,1\}$, $v \mapsto \mathbf{1}\{v \in \mathcal{C}_k(F)\}$ if $v \in \mathcal{V}(F)$ and $a \mapsto \mathbf{1}\{\partial a \subset \mathcal{C}_k(F)\}$ if $a \in \mathcal{F}(F)$. Finally, denote by F_x the component of $x \in \mathcal{V}(F) \cup \mathcal{F}(F)$ in F. In the case of the random r-uniform hypergraph we will use the shorthand $F_{\boldsymbol{H}} = \boldsymbol{F}$ and $\boldsymbol{F}_v = F_{\boldsymbol{H},v}$. Let $\boldsymbol{v}$ denote a randomly chosen vertex in $V(\boldsymbol{H})$. Then our aim is to determine the limiting distribution of $\partial^s[\boldsymbol{F}_{\boldsymbol{v}}, \boldsymbol{v}, \sigma_{k,\boldsymbol{F}_{\boldsymbol{v}}}]$ in the formalism of local weak convergence.

To this end, we construct a multi-type branching process that generates a acyclic factor graph that proceeds in two phases. Starting with a single root, which is a variable node, the levels of the process alternately consist of variable and factor nodes. This process exhibits 9 node types in total. The nodes at even distances from the root are variable nodes of possible types $\{000, 001, 010, 110, 111\}$, the nodes at odd distances are factor nodes of possible types $\{000, 001, 010, 111\}$. The branching process $\hat{\boldsymbol{T}}(d, r, k, p)$ has parameters d, r, k and a further parameter $p \in [0,1]$. Setting $c = c(d,r) = d/(r-1)!$ and

$$q = q(d,k,p) = \mathbb{P}\left[\mathrm{Po}(cp^{r-1}) = k-1 | \mathrm{Po}(cp^{r-1}) \geq k-1\right], \tag{1.1}$$

we define

$$p_{000} = 1-p, \qquad p_{010} = pq, \qquad p_{111} = p(1-q).$$

Finally, the branching process involves two other coefficients

$$\bar{q} = \bar{q}(d,k,p) = \mathbb{P}\left[\mathrm{Po}(cp^{r-1}) = k-2 | \mathrm{Po}(cp^{r-1}) \leq k-2\right]$$

and

$$\tilde{q} = \tilde{q}(d,k,p) = \mathbb{P}\left[\mathrm{Bin}\,(r-1,p) = r-2 | \mathrm{Bin}\,(r-1,p) \leq r-2\right].$$

The process starts with a single variable node v_0, the root. The root is of type 000, 010 or 111 with probability p_{000}, p_{010} and p_{111} respectively. Starting at v_0, every variable node has a random number of factor node children independently. The offspring distributions of variable nodes are defined by the generating functions in Figure 1 where $\boldsymbol{x} = (x_{000}, x_{001}, x_{010}, x_{111})$. That is, for an integer vector $\boldsymbol{y} = (y_{000}, y_{001}, y_{010}, y_{111})$ the probability that a variable node of type $v_1v_2v_3$ generates $y_{a_1a_2a_3}$ children of type $a_1a_2a_3$ for $a_1a_2a_3 \in \{000, 001, 010, 111\}$ equals the coefficient of $x_{000}^{y_{000}} \cdots x_{111}^{y_{111}}$ in $g_{v_1v_2v_3}(\boldsymbol{x})$. The offspring distributions of factor nodes follow in the same manner from Figure 2, where $\boldsymbol{z} = (z_{000}, z_{001}, z_{010}, z_{110}, z_{111})$.

Let $\boldsymbol{T}(d,r,k,p)$ denote the $\{0,1\}$-marked acyclic factor graph by giving mark 0 to all nodes of type 000, 001 or 010, and mark 1 to vertices of type 110 or 111. Then $\boldsymbol{T}(d,r,p)$ has 4 different types of nodes in total. Recall that $d_{r,k}$ is the threshold for the appearance of a extensive k-core in $\boldsymbol{H}$. Our main result is the following.

Theorem 1.1. *Assume that $r \geq 3$, $k \geq 2$ and $d > d_{r,k}$. Moreover, let p^* be the largest fixed point of the continuous function*

$$\phi_{d,r,k} : [0,1] \to [0,1], \qquad p \mapsto \mathbb{P}\left[\mathrm{Po}\left(\frac{d}{(r-1)!}p^{r-1}\right) \geq k-1\right]. \tag{1.2}$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
g_{000}(\boldsymbol{x}) &= \exp(cp^{r-1}(x_{000}-1))\frac{\sum_{h=0}^{k-2}(cp^{r-1}x_{010})^h/h!}{\sum_{h=0}^{k-2}(cp^{r-1})^h/h!},\\
g_{001}(\boldsymbol{x}) &= \bar{q}\left(\exp(cp^{r-1}(x_{001}-1))x_{010}^{k-2}\right)\\
&\qquad + (1-\bar{q})\left(\exp(cp^{r-1}(x_{000}-1))\frac{\sum_{h=0}^{k-3}(cp^{r-1}x_{010})^h/h!}{\sum_{h=0}^{k-3}(cp^{r-1})^h/h!}\right),\\
g_{010}(\boldsymbol{x}) &= \exp(cp^{r-1}(x_{001}-1))x_{010}^{k-1},\\
g_{110}(\boldsymbol{x}) &= \exp(cp^{r-1}(x_{001}-1))\frac{\sum_{h\geq k}(cp^{r-1}x_{111})^h/h!}{\sum_{h\geq k}(cp^{r-1})^h/h!},\\
g_{111}(\boldsymbol{x}) &= \exp(cp^{r-1}(x_{001}-1))\frac{\sum_{h\geq k-1}(cp^{r-1}x_{111})^h/h!}{\sum_{h\geq k-1}(cp^{r-1})^h/h!}.
\end{aligned}
$$

FIGURE 1. The generating functions $g_{v_1v_2v_3}(\boldsymbol{x})$ of variable nodes.

$$
\begin{aligned}
f_{000}(\boldsymbol{z}) &= \frac{\sum_{s=0}^{r-2}\binom{r-1}{s}p^s(1-p)^{r-1-s}(qz_{010}+(1-q)z_{110})^s z_{000}^{r-1-s}}{\sum_{h=0}^{r-2}\binom{r-1}{s}p^s(1-p)^{r-1-s}},\\
f_{001}(\boldsymbol{z}) &= \tilde{q}\left(z_{001}\left(qz_{010}+(1-q)z_{110}\right)^{r-2}\right)\\
&\qquad + (1-\tilde{q})\frac{\sum_{s=0}^{r-3}\binom{r-1}{s}p^s(1-p)^{r-1-s}(qz_{010}+(1-q)z_{110})^s z_{000}^{r-1-s}}{\sum_{h=0}^{r-3}\binom{r-1}{h}p^h(1-p)^{r-1-h}},\\
f_{010}(\boldsymbol{z}) &= \left(qz_{010}+(1-q)z_{110}\right)^{r-1},\\
f_{111}(\boldsymbol{z}) &= z_{111}^{r-1}.
\end{aligned}
$$

FIGURE 2. The generating functions $f_{a_1a_2a_3}(\boldsymbol{z})$ of factor nodes.

If τ is a rooted acyclic factor graph with marks in $\{0,1\}$, then

$$\frac{1}{n}\sum_{v\in\mathcal{V}(\boldsymbol{F})}\mathbf{1}\left\{\partial^\omega[\boldsymbol{F},v,\sigma_{k,\boldsymbol{F}_v}]=\partial^\omega[\tau]\right\}$$

converges to $\mathbb{P}\left[\partial^\omega[\boldsymbol{T}(d,r,k,p^*)]=\partial^\omega[\tau]\right]$ in probability.

Theorem 1.1 describes the limiting behavior of the local structure of the random factor graph $\boldsymbol{F}$. We will reformulate this result in the framework of local weak convergence, employed in [3]. This formalism is part of weak convergence theory. More precisely, we endow $\mathcal{G}^{\mathcal{X}}$ with the coarsest topology that makes all the maps

$$\kappa_{G,s}:\mathcal{G}^{\mathcal{X}}\to\{0,1\},\ G'\mapsto\mathbf{1}\left\{\partial^s G'\cong G\right\}\ \text{ for } G\in\mathcal{G}^{\mathcal{X}},\ s\geq 0 \tag{1.3}$$

continuous. Let $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{G}^{\mathcal{X}})$ and $\mathcal{P}^2(\mathcal{G}^{\mathcal{X}})$ denote the spaces of probability measures on $\mathcal{G}^{\mathcal{X}}$ and $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{G}^{\mathcal{X}})$, both equipped with the weak topology. For $G\in\mathcal{G}^{\mathcal{X}}$ let $\delta_G\in\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{G}^{\mathcal{X}})$ signify the Dirac measure on G. For $\lambda\in\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{G}^{\mathcal{X}})$ let $\delta_\lambda\in\mathcal{P}^2(\mathcal{G}^{\mathcal{X}})$ be the Dirac measure on λ. We reformulate our result in $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{F}^{\mathcal{X}})\subset\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{G}^{\mathcal{X}})$ and $\mathcal{P}^2(\mathcal{F}^{\mathcal{X}})\subset\mathcal{P}^2(\mathcal{G}^{\mathcal{X}})$ as follows.

Given a r-uniform factor graph let

$$\lambda_{k,F}=\frac{1}{|\mathcal{V}(F)|}\sum_{v\in\mathcal{V}(F)}\delta_{[F_v,v,\sigma_{k,F}]}\in\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{F}^{\{0,1\}})$$

be the empirical distribution of the neighbourhoods of variable nodes marked according to the core membership and define

$$\Lambda_{d,r,k,n} = \mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{F}}\left[\delta_{\lambda_{k,\boldsymbol{F}}}\right] \in \mathcal{P}^2(\mathcal{F}^{\{0,1\}}). \tag{1.4}$$

Finally, let

$$\vartheta_{d,r,k,p} = \mathcal{L}[\boldsymbol{T}(d,r,k,p)] \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{F}^{\{0,1\}}).$$

Then we can reformulate our result as follows.

Theorem 1.2. *Assume that $r \geq 3$, $k \geq 2$ and $d > d_{r,k}$. Let p^* be the largest fixed point of the function $\phi_{d,r,k}$ from (1.2). Then $\lim_{n\to\infty} \Lambda_{d,r,k,n} = \delta_{\vartheta_{d,r,k,p^*}}$.*

In § 4.4 we shall derive Theorem 1.1 from Theorem 1.2.

2. Preliminaries

2.1. **Notation.** Similarly as in § 1.2 we begin with introducing standard notions for graphs which carry over to the bipartite factor graphs introduced in § 1.2. Recall that for a graph G and a vertex $v \in V(G)$, $\partial_G v$ denotes the set of all vertices adjacent to v in G. Furthermore, we denote by $\partial^s(G,v)$ the subgraph of G induced on the set of vertices at distance at most s from v. We abbreviate $\partial(G,v) = \partial^1(G,v)$ and denote by ∂v the neighbourhood of v in G whenever G is clear from the context.

By a *rooted graph* we mean a connected locally finite graph G together with a distinguished root $v_0 \in V(G)$. A *child* of $v \in V(G)$ is a vertex $u \in \partial v$ whose distance from v_0 is greater than that of v. For a vertex v of a rooted graph G we denote by $\partial_+ v$ the set of all children of v.

We say that (G, v_0) and (G', v_0') are isomorphic if there is an isomorphism $\pi : G \to G'$ such that $\pi(v_0) = \pi(v_0')$. We denote by $[G, v_0]$ the isomorphism class of (G, v_0). Furthermore, we let $\mathcal{G}$ be the set of all isomorphism classes of rooted graphs. Finally, let $\partial^s[G, v_0]$ be the isomorphism class of $\partial^s(G, v_0)$. Again, for factor graphs F we will assume that $v_0 \in \mathcal{V}(F)$.

If X is a $\mathcal{E}$-valued random variable, we let $\mathcal{L}(X)$ denote the distribution of X. For real numbers $y, z > 0$ we let $\mathrm{Po}_{\geq z}(y)$ denote the Poisson distribution $\mathrm{Po}(y)$ conditioned on the event that it attains a value least z. Thus,

$$\mathbb{P}\left[\mathrm{Po}_{\geq z}(y) = x\right] = \frac{\mathbf{1}\left\{x \geq z\right\} y^x \exp(-y)}{x!\,\mathbb{P}\left[\mathrm{Po}(y) \geq z\right]} \qquad \text{for any integer } x \geq 0.$$

Similarly, we let $\mathrm{Bin}_{\geq z}(m, y)$ denote binomial distribution $\mathrm{Bin}(m, y)$ conditioned on the event that the outcome is at least z. That is,

$$\mathbb{P}\left[\mathrm{Bin}_{\geq z}(m, y) = x\right] = \frac{\mathbf{1}\left\{x \geq z\right\} \binom{m}{x} y^x (1-y)^{m-x}}{\mathbb{P}\left[\mathrm{Bin}(m, y) \geq z\right]} \qquad \text{for any integer } 0 \leq x \leq m.$$

The distributions $\mathrm{Po}_{>z}(y)$, $\mathrm{Po}_{\leq z}(y)$, $\mathrm{Po}_{<z}(y)$, $\mathrm{Bin}_{>z}(m, y)$, $\mathrm{Bin}_{\leq z}(m, y)$, $\mathrm{Bin}_{<z}(m, y)$ are defined analogously. Throughout the paper we will define various different probability distributions and random factor graphs. We provide tables of these definitions in the appendix.

2.2. **The local structure.** Recall that $c = c(d, r) = d/(r-1)!$ and let $\boldsymbol{T}(d, r)$ denote the following random recursive acyclic factor graph. $\boldsymbol{T}(d, r)$ starts with a variable node v_0, the root. Starting at v_0 every variable node has a $\mathrm{Po}(c)$ number of factor node children independently and each factor node has $r - 1$ variable node

children deterministicly. In the following we need to prove that $\boldsymbol{F}$ "locally" converges to $\boldsymbol{T}(d,r)$. Similar as before, we endow $\mathcal{G}$ with the coarsest topology that makes all the maps $\kappa_{G,s}:\mathcal{G}\to\{0,1\},\ G'\mapsto \mathbf{1}\{\partial^s G' = \partial^s G\}$ for fixed $s\geq 0, G\in\mathcal{G}$ continuous. Let $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{G})$ be the set of all probability measures on $\mathcal{G}$ together with the weak topology. Finally, let $\mathcal{P}^2(\mathcal{G})$ be the set of all probability measures on $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{G})$ also together with the weak topology. For a given factor graph F let

$$\lambda_F = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{V}(F)|}\sum_{v\in\mathcal{V}(F)}\delta_{[F_v,v]}\in\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{F}).$$

Further, let

$$\Lambda_{d,r,n} = \mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{F}}[\delta_{\lambda_{\boldsymbol{F}}}]\in\mathcal{P}^2(\mathcal{F}). \tag{2.1}$$

Then the following theorem expresses that "locally" $\boldsymbol{F}$ converges to $\boldsymbol{T}(d,r)$.

Theorem 2.1. *For any $r\geq 3$ and $d>0$, we have $\lim_{n\to\infty}\Lambda_{d,r,n} = \delta_{\mathcal{L}([\boldsymbol{T}(d,r)])}$.*

We provide a proof of Theorem 2.1 in the appendix.

2.3. **The k-core threshold.** We build upon the following result that determines the k-core threshold and the asymptotic size of the k-core. Recall that $\boldsymbol{F}$ is the random factor graph which is constructed from $\boldsymbol{H}$ and that $\mathcal{C}_k(\boldsymbol{F})$ denotes the set of variable nodes in the k-core of $\boldsymbol{F}$

Theorem 2.2 ([23])**.** *Let $r\geq 3$ and $k\geq 2$. Then the function $\lambda\in(0,\infty)\mapsto \lambda(r-1)!/(\mathbb{P}[\mathrm{Po}(\lambda)\geq k-1])^{r-1}$ is continuous, tends to infinite as $\lambda\to 0$ or $\lambda\to\infty$, and has a unique local minimum, where it attains the value*

$$d_{r,k} = \inf\left\{\lambda(r-1)!/(\mathbb{P}[\mathrm{Po}(\lambda)\geq k-1])^{r-1} : \lambda>0\right\}.$$

Furthermore, for any $d>d_{r,k}$ the equation $d=\lambda(r-1)!/(\mathbb{P}[\mathrm{Po}(\lambda)\geq k-1])^{r-1}$ has precisely two solutions. Let $\lambda_{r,k}(d)$ denote the larger one and define

$$\psi_{r,k}:(d_{r,k},\infty)\to(0,\infty),\qquad d\mapsto\mathbb{P}[\mathrm{Po}(\lambda_{r,k}(d))\geq k].$$

Then $\psi_{r,k}$ is a strictly increasing continuous function. Moreover, if $d<d_{r,k}$, then $\mathcal{C}_k(\boldsymbol{F})=\emptyset$ w.h.p., while $\frac{1}{n}|\mathcal{C}_k(\boldsymbol{F})|$ converges to $\psi_{r,k}(d)$ in probability for $d>d_{r,k}$.

The following lemma establishes a connection between Warning Propagation and the formula for the size of the k-core from Theorem 2.2. Similar statements are implicit in [22, 26]. Nevertheless, we provide a simple proof similar to the one in [11] to keep the present paper self-contained.

Lemma 2.3. *Suppose $d>d_{r,k}$ and let p^* be the largest fixed point of the function $\phi_{d,r,k}$ from (1.2). Then $\phi_{d,r,k}$ is contracting on the interval $[p^*,1]$. Moreover, $\psi_k(d)=\phi_{d,r,k+1}(p^*)$.*

Proof. Let $\varphi_k(x)=\mathbb{P}[\mathrm{Po}(x)\geq k-1]$ for $x\geq 0$. Then $\phi_{d,r,k}(p)=\varphi_k\left(\frac{d}{(r-1)!}p^{r-1}\right)$. Moreover,

$$d=\frac{\lambda(r-1)!}{\varphi_k(\lambda)^{r-1}}\quad\text{iff}\quad\phi_{d,r,k}\left(\left(\frac{\lambda(r-1)!}{d}\right)^{1/(r-1)}\right)=\left(\frac{\lambda(r-1)!}{d}\right)^{1/(r-1)}$$

i.e. λ is a solution to the left equation iff $(\lambda(r-1)!/d)^{1/(r-1)}$ is a fixed point of $\phi_{d,r,k}$. Since $p^*=p^*(d,r,k)$ is the largest fixed point of $\phi_{d,r,k}$, it holds that

$p^* = (\lambda_{r,k}(d)(r-1)!/d)^{1/(r-1)}$, where $\lambda_{r,k}(d)$ is as in Theorem 2.2. By Theorem 2.2 this implies that

$$\psi_{r,k}(d) = \mathbb{P}\left(\mathrm{Po}(\lambda_{r,k}(d)) \geq k\right) = \mathbb{P}\left(\mathrm{Po}(d/(r-1)!{p^*}^{r-1} \geq k\right) = \phi_{d,r,k+1}\left(p^*\right).$$

Our aim is to prove that $\phi_{d,r,k}$ is contracting on the interval $[p^*, 1]$. To this end, we will first show that $p^*(d,r,k) > 0$ if $d > d_{r,k}$. By Theorem 2.2, $d_{r,k} = \inf\left\{ \lambda/((r-1)!\varphi_k(\lambda)^{r-1}) \middle| \lambda > 0 \right\}$. Furthermore, $\lambda_{r,k}(d_{r,k}) \geq 0$ by definition. Since $\lambda_{r,k}(d)$ is a strictly increasing in d, it holds that $\lambda_{r,k}(d) > \lambda_{r,k}(d_{r,k}) \geq 0$. Using $p^* = (\lambda_{r,k}(d)(r-1)!/d)^{1/(r-1)}$ this implies $p^* = p^*(d,r,k) > 0$ for $r \geq 3$, $k \geq 2$ and $d > d_{r,k}$.

Finally, it remains to prove that $\phi_{d,r,k}$ is a contraction on $[p^*, 1]$. The derivatives of φ_k read as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial}{\partial x}\varphi_k(x) &= \frac{1}{(k-2)!\exp(x)}x^{k-2} \geq 0, \\ \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2}\varphi_k(x) &= \frac{1}{(k-1)!\exp(x)}(-x+k-2)x^{k-3}. \end{aligned}$$

Using

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial p}\phi_{d,k,r}(p) = \frac{d}{(r-2)!}p^{r-2}\frac{\partial}{\partial x}\ \varphi_k(x)\big|_{x=\frac{dp^{r-1}}{(r-1)!}}$$

and

$$\frac{\partial^2}{\partial p^2}\phi_{d,k,r}(p) = \frac{d}{(r-3)!}p^{r-3}\frac{\partial}{\partial x}\ \varphi_k(x)\big|_{x=\frac{dp^{r-1}}{(r-1)!}} + \frac{d^2}{((r-2)!)^2}p^{2r-4}\frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2}\ \varphi_k(x)\big|_{x=\frac{dp^{r-1}}{(r-1)!}}$$

we obtain $\frac{\partial}{\partial p}\phi_{d,r,k}(p) \geq 0$ for all $p \in [0,1]$ and $\frac{\partial^2}{\partial p^2}\phi_{d,r,k}(p) = 0$ iff $p = p_0 = ((2rk-3r-3k+4)(r-2)!/d)^{1/(r-1)}$. Hence, $\partial^2/\partial p^2 \phi_{d,r,k}$ has only one root in $[0,1]$ and $\phi_{d,r,k}$ is convex on $[0,p_0]$ and concave on $(p_0,1]$. This means that apart from the trivial fixed point at $p=0$ the function $\phi_{d,r,k}$ either has one additional fixed point $p^* > 0$ or two additional fixed points $p^* > p_1 > 0$. In total, three possible cases can occur. The first case is that $\phi_{d,r,k}$ has only one additional fixed point and is tangent to the identity at p^*. The second case is that $\phi_{d,r,k}$ has only one additional fixed point, but has derivative at least one at the point $p=0$. Then $\phi_{d,r,k}$ crosses the identity function at the point p^*. Finally, $\phi_{d,r,k}$ can have two additional fixed points $p^* > p_1 > 0$, where $\phi_{d,r,k}$ crosses the identity. Our aim is to prove that the first case can not occur if $p^* > 0$. Therefore, suppose it occurs for some d', and let d'' be such that $d_{r,k} < d'' < d'$. Then $\phi_{d'',r,k}(p) < \phi_{d',r,k}(p) \leq p$ for all $p > 0$. This means that $p^*(d'',r,k) = 0$, which contradicts the first part of the proof. Therefore, it holds that $\phi_{d,r,k}$ crosses the identity at $p^* > 0$. Then it follows from $\phi_{d,r,k}(1) < 1$ and the fact that $\partial^2\phi_{d,r,k}/\partial p^2$ changes its sign only once in $[0,1]$, that $\phi_{d,r,k}$ is concave on $[p^*,1]$. Furthermore, by $\frac{\partial}{\partial p}\phi_{d,r,k}(p) \geq 0$ the function $\phi_{d,r,k}$ is monotonically increasing on $[p^*,1]$. Therefore, its derivative is less than one on this interval and the assertion follows. □

3. Warning Propagation and the k-core

Suppose that F is a given input factor graph which is r-uniform. To identify the k-core of F we adopt the Warning Propagation messages passing algorithm, [21]. Warning Propagation is based on introducing messages on the edges of F and marks on the nodes of F. Messages and marks have values in $\{0,1\}$. Both will be

updated in terms of a time parameter $t \geq 0$. The messages are directed objects. That is for every pair of adjacent nodes $v \in \mathcal{V}(F)$ and $a \in \mathcal{F}(F)$ and any time $t \geq 0$ there is a messages $\mu_{v\to a}(t|F)$ "from v to a" and a message $\mu_{a\to v}(t|F)$ in the opposite direction. Similarly, we distinguish between the marks $\mu_a(t|F)$ of factor nodes a and the marks $\mu_v(t|F)$ of variable nodes v. At time $t = 0$ we start with the configuration in which all messages in both directions are equal to 1, i.e.,

$$\mu_{v\to a}(0|F) = \mu_{a\to v}(0|F) = 1 \tag{3.1}$$

for all $a \in \mathcal{F}(F)$ and $v \in \partial a$. Inductively, writing ∂x for the set of neighbours of x in F and abbreviating $\partial x \setminus y = \partial x \setminus \{y\}$, we let

$$\mu_{v\to a}(t+1|F) = \mathbf{1}\left\{\sum_{b\in\partial v\setminus a} \mu_{b\to v}(t|F) \geq k-1\right\} \tag{3.2}$$

and

$$\mu_{a\to v}(t+1|F) = \mathbf{1}\left\{\sum_{w\in\partial a\setminus v} \mu_{w\to a}(t|F) = r-1\right\}. \tag{3.3}$$

Additionally, the mark of $v \in \mathcal{V}(F)$ at time t is

$$\mu_v(t|F) = \mathbf{1}\left\{\sum_{a\in\partial v} \mu_{a\to v}(t|F) \geq k\right\}. \tag{3.4}$$

The mark of $a \in \mathcal{F}(F)$ at time t is

$$\mu_a(t|F) = \mathbf{1}\left\{\sum_{v\in\partial a} \mu_{v\to a}(t|F) = r\right\}. \tag{3.5}$$

Note that the Warning Propagation description is similar to the peeling process introduced in § 1.1. At time $t = 1$ every variable node v of degree strictly less than k will send message $\mu_{v\to a}(1|F) = 0$ to all its neighbours a. That is, at time $t = 1$ we "delete" every factor node a adjacent to v from F by setting its mark to $\mu_a(1|F) = 0$. Thus, other that the peeling process Warning Propagation simultaneously deletes all factor nodes adjacent to variable nodes of degree less that k from F. Along these lines, the intuition is that if $\mu_x(t|F) = 0$ for $t \geq 0$, then after t iterations of Warning Propagation it is ruled out that x belongs to the k-core of F.

3.1. **Convergence to the k-core.** The aim of this section is to reduce the study of the k-core of $\boldsymbol{F}$ to the analysis of Warning Propagation on the random tree $\boldsymbol{T}(d, r)$ that describes the local structure of $\boldsymbol{F}$. The following proof strongly resembles our prior analysis in [11] and the study of Warning Propagation in the context of the k-XORSAT problem (cf. [21, Chapter 19]).

Lemma 3.1. *Let F be a locally finite r-uniform factor graph.*

1. *All messages and marks of Warning Propagation on F are monotonically decreasing in t.*
2. *For any $t \geq 0$ we have $\mathcal{C}_k(F) \subset \{v \in \mathcal{V}(F) : \mu_v(t|F) = 1\}$.*
3. *For any node x the $\lim_{t\to\infty} \mu_x(t|F)$ exist and node x belongs to the k-core of F iff $\lim_{t\to\infty} \mu_x(t|F) = 1$.*

Proof. To obtain (1), we show by induction that, in fact, for any v and $a \in \partial v$

$$A^{(1)}(t): \ \mu_{v\to a}(t+1|G) \le \mu_{v\to a}(t|G)$$
$$B^{(1)}(t): \ \mu_{a\to v}(t+1|G) \le \mu_{a\to v}(t|G)$$

for all $t \ge 0$. Properties $A^{(1)}(0)$ and $B^{(1)}(0)$ are certainly true because of our starting conditions (3.1). Properties $A^{(1)}(t+1)$ and $B^{(1)}(t+1)$ follow from $A^{(1)}(t) \wedge B^{(1)}(t) \Rightarrow A^{(1)}(t+1) \wedge B^{(1)}(t+1)$ with (3.2) and (3.3). The marks are decreasing in t with (3.4) and (3.5).

To obtain (2), we show by induction that, in fact, any variable node v and factor node a in the core satisfy

$$A^{(2)}(t): \ \mu_{v\to b}(t|G) = 1 \ \text{ for all } b \in \partial_F v$$
$$B^{(2)}(t): \ \mu_{v}(t|G) = 1$$
$$C^{(2)}(t): \ \mu_{a\to w}(t|G) = 1 \ \text{ for all } w \in \partial_F a$$
$$D^{(2)}(t): \ \mu_{a}(t|G) = 1$$

for all $t \ge 0$. Properties $A^{(2)}(0)$ and $C^{(2)}(0)$ are certainly true because of our starting conditions. We will show that for all $t \ge 0$, $A^{(2)}(t) \wedge C^{(2)}(t) \Rightarrow A^{(2)}(t+1) \wedge B^{(2)}(t) \wedge C^{(2)}(t+1) \wedge D^{(2)}(t)$. This follows because every variable node v has at least k neighbours in the core, also with $\mu_{a\to v}(t|F) = 1$ if $C^{(2)}(t)$ holds, and so (3.4) implies that $B^{(2)}(t)$ holds while (3.2) implies that $A^{(2)}(t+1)$ holds. Now, let a be a factor node in the core, then a has exactly r neighbours v which are in the core. If $A^{(2)}(t)$ holds, then (3.5) and (3.3) imply $D^{(2)}(t)$ and $C^{(2)}(t+1)$.

To obtain (3), let F' be the subgraph of the factor graph induced by the nodes x with $\lim_{t\to\infty} \mu_x(t|F) = 1$. The second part of this lemma implies that $\mathcal{C}_k(F) \subset \mathcal{V}(F')$. Now, let v be a function node in F'. Since F is locally finite, it holds that $|\partial v| < \infty$ and so there is a time t_0 such that the messages $\mu_{v\to a}(t|F)$ and $\mu_{a\to v}(t|F)$ remain constant. Since $v \in F'$ it holds that $\mu_v(t_0|F) = 1$ and (3.4) implies that $\sum_{a\in\partial v} \mu_{a\to v}(t_0|F) \ge k$ and therefore $\mu_{v\to a}(t_0+1|F) = 1$ for all $a \in \partial v$. Now, let $a \in \partial v$ with $\mu_{a\to v}(t_0+1|F) = 1$, then (3.5) implies that $\mu_a(t_0+1|F) = 1$. Since the mark at a remains constant after time t_0 it holds that $u \in F'$ for all $u \in \partial a \setminus v$. Since there are at least k such edges it holds that $\mathcal{V}(F') \subset \mathcal{C}_k(H)$. □

3.2. **Warning Propagation and the local structure.** In this section we begin with the analysis of Warning Propagation on the random tree $\boldsymbol{T}(d, r)$. This first step will enable us to make a connection between Warning Propagation and the fixed point problem studied in § 2.3. Assume that (T, v_0) is a rooted locally finite acyclic factor graph. Then by definition the root $v_0 \in \mathcal{V}(T)$ is a variable node of T. Furthermore, starting with v_0, T consists of consecutive layers of variable and factor nodes. Let x be a node of T different from the root, then we refer to the neighbor y of x on the path to v_0 as the "parent" of x. That is, a variable node $v \neq v_0$ has a parent $a \in \mathcal{F}(T)$ and a factor node b has a parent $w \in \mathcal{V}(T)$. We use the shorthand

$$\mu_{v\uparrow}(t|T) = \mu_{v\to a}(t|T) \quad \text{and} \quad \mu_{b\uparrow}(t|T) = \mu_{b\to w}(t|T).$$

In addition, we let

$$\mu_{v_0\uparrow}(0|T) = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \mu_{v_0\uparrow}(t|T) = \mathbf{1}\left\{\sum_{a\in\partial v_0} \mu_{a\to v_0}(t-1|T) \geq k-1\right\} \text{ for } t > 0\ .$$

The following Lemma enables us to make a connection between Warning Propagation on $\boldsymbol{T}(d,r)$ and the fixed point problem from § 2.3.

Lemma 3.2. *The sequence $(\mu_{v_0\uparrow}(t|\boldsymbol{T}(d,r)))_{t\geq 1}$ converges almost surely to a random variable in $\{0,1\}$ whose expectation is equal to p^*. In particular, it holds that $\mathbb{E}[\mu_{v_0\uparrow}(t|\boldsymbol{T}(d,r))]$ converges to p^* as t tends to infinity.*

Proof. Let $p^{(0)} = 1$ and $p^{(t)} = \mathbb{E}[\mu_{v_0\uparrow}(t|\boldsymbol{T}(d,r))]$ for $t \geq 1$. Then we obtain that $p^{(1)} = \mathbb{P}\left(\mathrm{Po}(d/(r-1)!) \geq k-1\right) = \phi_{d,r,k}(1)$.

For $t \geq 2$ we use that random tree $\boldsymbol{T}(d,r)$ is recursive. Given the degree of the root v_0, the messages $\mu_{v\uparrow}(t|\boldsymbol{T}(d,r))$ for variable nodes v at distance 2 from v_0 are mutually independent Bernoulli variables with mean $p^{(t)}$. Since each factor node $a \in \partial v_0$ has $r-1$ children, it holds that $\mathbb{P}\left(\mu_{a\uparrow}(t+1|\boldsymbol{T}(d,r)) = 1\right) = {p^{(t)}}^{r-1}$. Since the degree of v_0 is a Poisson variable with mean $d/(r-1)!$, we conclude that

$$p^{(t+2)} = \mathbb{P}\left(\mathrm{Po}\left(\frac{d}{(r-1)!}{p^{(t)}}^{r-1}\right) \geq k-1\right) = \phi_{d,r,k}\left(p^{(t)}\right) \qquad \text{for any } t \geq 0.$$

By Lemma 2.3, $\phi_{d,r,k}$ is contracting on $[p^*,1]$. This implies that $\lim_{t\to\infty} p^{(t)} = p^*$. Furthermore, by Lemma 3.1 the sequence $(\mu_{v_0\uparrow}(t|\boldsymbol{T}(d,r)))_{t\geq 1}$ is monotonically decreasing. Applying the monotone convergence theorem we conclude that $(\mu_{v_0\uparrow}(t|\boldsymbol{T}(d,r)))_{t\geq 1}$ converges almost surely. □

3.3. **Back to hypergraphs.** Let $t \geq 0$. We denote by $\boldsymbol{T}_t(d,r,k)$ the random $\{0,1\}$-marked tree which is obtained by marking each node x in $\boldsymbol{T}(d,r)$ with its Warning Propagation mark $\mu_x(t|\boldsymbol{T}(d,r)) \in \{0,1\}$. The aim in this section is to prove the following Proposition.

Proposition 3.3. *The limits*

$$\theta_{d,r,k} := \lim_{t\to\infty} \mathcal{L}([\boldsymbol{T}_t(d,r,k)])\Lambda_{d,r,k} := \lim_{n\to\infty} \Lambda_{d,r,k,n}$$

exist and $\Lambda_{d,r,k} = \delta_{\theta_{d,r,k}}$.

Lemma 3.1 implies that the k-core of F is contained in the set of all nodes which are marked with 1 after t rounds of Warning Propagation. Additionally, the following lemma implies that in the case of the random factor graph $\boldsymbol{F}$ a bounded number of iterations is enough to give a good approximation to the k-core of $\boldsymbol{F}$.

Lemma 3.4. *For any $\varepsilon > 0$ there is $t > 0$ s.t. $|\{v \in [n] : \mu_v(t|\boldsymbol{F}) = 1\} \setminus \mathcal{C}_k(\boldsymbol{F})| \leq \varepsilon n$ w.h.p.*

Proof. To prove the above statement let

$$Y_n = \frac{1}{n}|\mathcal{C}_k(\boldsymbol{F})| \text{ and } X_n(t) = \frac{1}{n}|\{v \in [n] : \mu_v(t|\boldsymbol{F}) = 1\}|$$

be the fraction of nodes in the k-core of $\boldsymbol{F}$ and the fraction of nodes labelled with 1 after t iterations of Warning Propagation respectively. Furthermore, let $x^{(t)} = \mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{T}(d,r)}[\mu_{v_0}(t|\boldsymbol{T}(d,r)]$. By the previous lemma it holds that $X_n(t)$ converges to $x^{(t)}$ in probability as n tends to infinity. On the other hand, from Theorem 2.2

and Lemma 2.3 we know that Y_n converges to $\phi_{d,r,k+1}(p^*)$ in probability as n tends to infinity. Finally, by Lemma 3.2 it holds that

$$\mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{T}(d,r)}[\mu_{v_0\uparrow}(t|\boldsymbol{T}(d,r)] \to p^* \tag{3.6}$$

deterministicly as t tends to infinity. We can apply (3.6) to each child v of v_0 in $\boldsymbol{T}(d,r)$. Therefore, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} x^{(t+1)} &= \mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{v\in\partial v_0} \mu_{v\uparrow}(t|\boldsymbol{T}(d,r)) \geq k\right) \\ &= \mathbb{P}\left(\mathrm{Po}\left(dp^{(t)}\right) \geq k)\right) \to \mathbb{P}\left(\mathrm{Po}(dp^*) \geq k\right) = \phi_{d,r,k+1}(p^*). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, for suitable t we conclude $\mathbb{P}\left(|Y_n - X_n(t)| \geq \varepsilon\right) \to 0$ as n tends infinity. □

To prove the main result of this subsection we will first show that the distribution of the neighborhoods of the random factor graph $\boldsymbol{F}$ marked according to $\mu_{\cdot}(t|\boldsymbol{F})$ is described by the distribution of $\boldsymbol{T}(d,r)$ together with Warning Propagation after t rounds. Recall that $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{G}^{\mathcal{X}})$ and $\mathcal{P}^2(\mathcal{G}^{\mathcal{X}})$ denote the spaces of probability measures on $\mathcal{G}^{\mathcal{X}}$ and $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{G}^{\mathcal{X}})$ respectively, both equipped with the weak topology. It is well known that both spaces are Polish, i.e. complete, separable and metrizable, [3]. Therefore, there are two useful equivalent characterizations of weak convergence in these spaces. To prove that a sequence of probability measures $(\mu_n)_n$ in $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{G}^{\mathcal{X}})$ is convergent it suffices to show, that the sequence $(\int f \mathrm{d}\mu_n)_n$ is convergent for any continuous function $f : \mathcal{G}^{\mathcal{X}} \to \mathbb{R}$ with bounded support or for all functions $f = \kappa_{F,s}$, $F \in \mathcal{F}^{\mathcal{X}}$, $s \geq 0$. The first characterization holds equivalently in $\mathcal{P}^2(\mathcal{G}^{\mathcal{X}})$.

For a factor graph F and $x \in \mathcal{V}(F) \cup \mathcal{F}(F)$ let $\mu_{\cdot}(t|F_x)$ denote the map $y \mapsto \mu_y(t|F_x)$. Define

$$\lambda_{k,F,t} := \frac{1}{|\mathcal{V}(F)|} \sum_{v\in\mathcal{V}(F)} \delta_{[F_v, v, \mu_{\cdot}(t|F_v)]} \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{F}^{\{0,1\}})$$

and

$$\Lambda_{d,r,k,n,t} := \mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{F}}[\delta_{\lambda_{k,\boldsymbol{F},t}}] \in \mathcal{P}^2(\mathcal{F}^{\{0,1\}}). \tag{3.7}$$

Thus, $\Lambda_{d,r,k,n,t}$ is the distribution of the neighbourhoods of the random graph $\boldsymbol{F}$ marked according to $\mu_{\cdot}(t|\boldsymbol{F})$.

Lemma 3.5. *We have* $\lim_{n\to\infty} \Lambda_{d,r,k,n,t} = \delta_{\mathcal{L}([\boldsymbol{T}_t(d,r,k)])}$ *for any* $t \geq 0$.

Proof. Let τ be a locally finite acyclic factor graph rooted at v_0 and let F be a factor graph such that $\partial^{s+t}[F,v] \cong \partial^{s+t}[\tau, v_0]$ for some variable node $v \in \mathcal{V}(F)$. Assume we would like to study Warning Propagation on $\partial^s[F,v]$ after t iterations on F. By definition of Warning Propagation, all Warning Propagation marks of vertices in $\partial^s[F,v]$ are determined by the initialization of Warning Propagation and the structure of $\partial^{s+t}[F,v]$. Therefore, if $\partial^{s+t}[F,v] \cong \partial^{s+t}[\tau,v_0]$ holds, we obtain that $\partial^s[F,v,\mu_{\cdot}(t|F)] \cong \partial^s[\tau,v_0,\mu_{\cdot}(t|\tau)]$. The assertion follows from Theorem 2.1. □

Lemma 3.6. *We have* $\lim_{n\to\infty} \Lambda_{d,r,k,n} = \lim_{t\to\infty} \lim_{n\to\infty} \Lambda_{d,r,k,n,t}$.

Proof. Let $f : \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{G}^{\{0,1\}}) \to \mathbb{R}$ be continuous with compact support. Lemma 3.5 implies that $(\Lambda_{d,r,k,n,t})_n$ converges for any t. Hence, so does $(\int f \mathrm{d}\Lambda_{d,r,k,n,t})_n$. Therefore, we will compare $\int f \mathrm{d}\Lambda_{d,r,k,n}$ and $\int f \mathrm{d}\Lambda_{d,r,k,n,t}$. Plugging in the definitions of $\Lambda_{d,r,k,n}$ and $\Lambda_{d,r,k,n,t}$ ((1.4) and (3.7)), we find that

$$\int f\mathrm{d}\Lambda_{d,r,k,n} = \mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{F}}\left[f(\lambda_{k,\boldsymbol{F}})\right], \qquad \int f\mathrm{d}\Lambda_{d,r,k,n,t} = \mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{F}}\left[f(\lambda_{k,\boldsymbol{F},t})\right].$$

Hence,

$$\left|\int f\mathrm{d}\Lambda_{d,r,k,n} - \int f\mathrm{d}\Lambda_{d,r,k,n,t}\right| \leq \mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{F}}\left|f(\lambda_{k,\boldsymbol{F}}) - f(\lambda_{k,\boldsymbol{F},t})\right|. \tag{3.8}$$

To bound the last term we will show that

$$\left|\int \kappa_{F,s}\mathrm{d}\lambda_{k,\boldsymbol{F}} - \int \kappa_{F,s}\mathrm{d}\lambda_{k,\boldsymbol{F},t}\right| \overset{t,n\to\infty}{\longrightarrow} 0 \tag{3.9}$$

in probability for all $F \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{F}_{\{0,1\}})$ and $s \geq 0$. Plugging in the definitions of $\lambda_{k,\boldsymbol{F}}$ and $\lambda_{k,\boldsymbol{F},t}$ we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{F}}\left|\int \kappa_{F,s}\mathrm{d}\lambda_{k,\boldsymbol{F}} - \int \kappa_{F,s}\mathrm{d}\lambda_{k,\boldsymbol{F},t}\right| \\
&\quad\leq \mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{F}}\left[\frac{1}{n}\sum_{v\in[n]}\left|\int \kappa_{F,s}\mathrm{d}\delta_{[\boldsymbol{F}_v,v,\sigma_{k,\boldsymbol{F}_v}]} - \int \kappa_{F,s}\mathrm{d}\delta_{[\boldsymbol{F}_v,v,\mu_\cdot(t|\boldsymbol{F}_v)]}\right|\right] \\
&\quad= \mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{F},\boldsymbol{v}}\left[\left|\kappa_{F,s}([\boldsymbol{F}_{\boldsymbol{v}},\boldsymbol{v},\sigma_{k,\boldsymbol{F}_{\boldsymbol{v}}}]) - \kappa_{F,s}([\boldsymbol{F}_{\boldsymbol{v}},\boldsymbol{v},\mu_\cdot(t,\boldsymbol{F}_{\boldsymbol{v}})])\right|\right].
\end{aligned}$$

By the definition of $\kappa_{F,s}$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{F},\boldsymbol{v}}\left[\left|\kappa_{\Gamma,s}([\boldsymbol{F}_{\boldsymbol{v}},\boldsymbol{v},\sigma_{k,\boldsymbol{F}_{\boldsymbol{v}}}]) - \kappa_{\Gamma,s}([\boldsymbol{F}_{\boldsymbol{v}},\boldsymbol{v},\mu_\cdot(t,\boldsymbol{F}_{\boldsymbol{v}})])\right|\right] \\
&\qquad\leq \mathbb{P}\left[\partial^s[\boldsymbol{F}_{\boldsymbol{v}},\boldsymbol{v},\sigma_{k,\boldsymbol{F}_{\boldsymbol{v}}}] \neq \partial^s[\boldsymbol{F}_{\boldsymbol{v}},\boldsymbol{v},\mu_\cdot(t|\boldsymbol{F}_{\boldsymbol{v}})]\right].
\end{aligned} \tag{3.10}$$

If v is such that $\partial^s[\boldsymbol{F}_{\boldsymbol{v}},\boldsymbol{v},\sigma_{k,\boldsymbol{F}_{\boldsymbol{v}}}] \neq \partial^s[\boldsymbol{F}_{\boldsymbol{v}},\boldsymbol{v},\mu_\cdot(t|\boldsymbol{F}_{\boldsymbol{v}})]$, then by Lemma 3.1 this means that after t iterations of Warning Propagation on $\boldsymbol{F}$ there is a vertex u at distance at most s from v such that $\mu_u(t|\boldsymbol{F}) = 1$, but $u \notin \mathcal{C}_k(\boldsymbol{F})$. By Lemma 3.4, we can bound the probability that such u exists provided that there are not too many vertices at distance at most s from v in total. By Theorem 2.1 this is the case for most vertices v. Therefore we can bound the right hand side of (3.10).

To make this more precise let $\delta > 0$ and denote by $\mathcal{I}(\ell,\boldsymbol{F})$ the set of all variable nodes v in $\boldsymbol{F}$ such that $\partial^s[\boldsymbol{F}_v,v]$ contains more than ℓ variable and factor nodes. Theorem 2.1 implies that there exists $\ell_0 = \ell_0(\delta,d)$ such that $\mathbb{P}\left[|\mathcal{I}(\ell_0,\boldsymbol{F})| > \delta n\right] \leq \delta$. Further, let $\mathcal{J}(\boldsymbol{F})$ be the set of all variable nodes $v \in [n]\setminus\mathcal{I}(\ell_0,\boldsymbol{F})$ such that there is a vertex $u \in \partial^s[\boldsymbol{F}_v,v]$ with $u \notin \mathcal{C}_k(\boldsymbol{F})$, but $\mu_u(t|\boldsymbol{F}) = 1$. Then Lemma 3.4 implies that $\mathbb{P}\left[|\mathcal{J}(\boldsymbol{F})| > \delta n\right] \leq \delta$, provided that $n \geq n_0(\delta)$ and $t \geq t_0(\delta)$ are sufficiently large. Hence, conditioning on the event $\{|\mathcal{I}(\ell_0,\boldsymbol{F})| \leq \delta n, |\mathcal{J}(\boldsymbol{F})| \leq \delta n\}$ and its complement implies

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{P}\left[\partial^s[\boldsymbol{F}_{\boldsymbol{v}},\boldsymbol{v},\sigma_{k,\boldsymbol{F}_{\boldsymbol{v}}}] \neq \partial^s[\boldsymbol{F}_{\boldsymbol{v}},\boldsymbol{v},\mu_\cdot(t,\boldsymbol{F}_{\boldsymbol{v}})]\right] \\
&\quad\leq \mathbb{P}\left[|\mathcal{I}(\ell_0,\boldsymbol{F})| > \delta n\right] + \mathbb{P}\left[|\mathcal{J}(\boldsymbol{F})| > \delta n\right] \\
&\qquad + \mathbb{P}\left[\boldsymbol{v} \in \mathcal{I}(\ell_0,\boldsymbol{F})\cup\mathcal{J}(\boldsymbol{F}) \,||\mathcal{I}(\ell_0,\boldsymbol{F})| \leq \delta n, |\mathcal{J}(\boldsymbol{F})| \leq \delta n\right] \leq 4\delta
\end{aligned}$$

and we obtain (3.9). Now, let $\varepsilon > 0$. Similarly as in the proof of Theorem 1.2 we use that $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{G}_{\{0,1\}})$ is a Polish space and therefore metrizable. Using this and the fact that the functions $\kappa_{F,s}$ generate the topology on $\mathcal{F}_{\{0,1\}}$, (3.9) implies that for given $\delta = \delta(\varepsilon) > 0$ there exist $n > n_0(\delta)$, $t > t_0(\delta)$ such that the distance of $\lambda_{\boldsymbol{F},k}$

and $\lambda_{\boldsymbol{F},k,t}$ in an appropriate metric is less than δ with probability larger than $1-\varepsilon$. f is continuous with compact support and thus uniformly continuous. This implies

$$\mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{F}} |f(\lambda_{k,\boldsymbol{F}}) - f(\lambda_{k,\boldsymbol{F},t})| < \varepsilon. \tag{3.11}$$

for suitable $\delta > 0$.

Combining (3.8) and (3.11) we obtain

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \Lambda_{d,r,k,n} = \lim_{t\to\infty} \lim_{n\to\infty} \Lambda_{d,r,k,n,t}$$

as desired. □

Proof of Proposition 3.3.
We begin with proving that the sequence $(\mathcal{L}([\boldsymbol{T}_t(d,r,k)]))_t$ converges in $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{G}_{\{0,1\}})$. Since $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{G}_{\{0,1\}})$ is a Polish space, it suffices to show that for any bounded continuous function $f : \mathcal{F}_{\{0,1\}} \to \mathbb{R}$ the sequence $(\mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{T}(d,r)}[f([\boldsymbol{T}_t(d,r,k)])])_t$ converges. Since the topology on $\mathcal{F}_{\{0,1\}}$ is generated by the functions $\kappa_{F,s}$ it suffices to assume that $f = \kappa_{F,s}$ for some $F \in \mathcal{F}_{\{0,1\}}$, $s \geq 0$. Hence,

$$\mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{T}(d,r)}[f([\boldsymbol{T}_t(d,r,k)])] = \mathbb{P}\left[\partial^s[\boldsymbol{T}_t(d,r,k)] = \partial^s F\right].$$

To show that $(\mathbb{P}\left[\partial^s[\boldsymbol{T}_t(d,r,k)] = \partial^s F\right])_t$ converges, let $\varepsilon > 0$, $q \geq 0$ and let $\mathcal{T}_q$ be the σ-algebra generated by $\partial^q[\boldsymbol{T}(d,r)]$. Let $\mathcal{B}(q)$ be the set of vertices at level s in $\boldsymbol{T}(d,r)$. We will distinguish between the cases that s is odd and even.

First, let s be odd. Then $\mathcal{B}(s+1)$ consists of variable nodes. The structure of the random tree $\boldsymbol{T}(d,r)$ is recursive, i.e., given $\mathcal{T}_{s+1}$ the tree pending on each vertex $v \in \mathcal{B}(s+1)$ is just an independent copy of $\boldsymbol{T}(d,r)$ itself. Therefore, Lemma 3.2 and the union bound imply that conditioned on $\mathcal{T}_{s+1}$ the limits

$$\mu_{v\uparrow}(\boldsymbol{T}(d,r)) = \lim_{t\to\infty} \mu_{v\uparrow}(t|\boldsymbol{T}(d,r)) \qquad (v \in \mathcal{B}(s+1))$$

exist almost surely.

All limits $\lim_{t\to\infty} \mu_x(t|\boldsymbol{T}(d,r))$ for nodes x at distance at most s from v_0 are determined by the limits $\mu_{v\uparrow}(\boldsymbol{T}(d,r))$ for $v \in \mathcal{B}(s+1)$. Therefore, the sequence $(\mathbb{P}\left[\partial^s[\boldsymbol{T}_t(d,r,k)] = \partial^s F|\mathcal{T}_{s+1}\right])_t$ of random variables converges almost surely. This immediately implies that $(\mathbb{P}\left[\partial^s[\boldsymbol{T}_t(d,r,k)] = \partial^s F\right])_t$ converges almost surely. If s is even, we can use the same argument for variable nodes in $\mathcal{B}(s+2)$ and conditioning on $\mathcal{T}_{s+2}$ to show that the sequence $(\mathbb{P}\left[\partial^s[\boldsymbol{T}_t(d,r,k)] = \partial^s F|\mathcal{T}_{s+2}\right])_t$ converges. Again, this implies convergence of the sequence $(\mathbb{P}\left[\partial^s[\boldsymbol{T}_t(d,r,k)] = \partial^s F\right])_t$. As this holds for any Γ, s, the limit $\theta_{d,r,k} = \lim_{t\to\infty} \mathcal{L}([\boldsymbol{T}_t(d,r,k)])$ exists. Therefore, it holds that $\lim_{t\to\infty} \delta_{\mathcal{L}([\boldsymbol{T}_t(d,r,k)])} = \delta_{\theta_{d,r,k}}$. Finally, by Lemma 3.6 and Lemma 3.5 we obtain $\lim_{n\to\infty} \Lambda_{d,r,k,n} = \delta_{\theta_{d,r,k}}$, which completes the proof.

4. The multi-type branching process

In this section we prove that the $\{0,1\}$-marked tree $\boldsymbol{T}_t(d,r,k)$ converges to the projection $\boldsymbol{T}(d,r,k,p^*)$ of the 9-type branching process $\hat{\boldsymbol{T}}(d,r,k,p^*)$ from § 1.2 as $t \to \infty$. This will imply Theorem 1.2.

4.1. **Truncating the tree.** We begin with characterizing the limiting distribution of the first s levels of $\boldsymbol{T}_t(d,r,k)$. Though our ultimate interest is in the Warning Propagation marks on $\boldsymbol{T}(d,r)$, a first important step of our proof is studying the bottom up messages $\mu_{x\uparrow}(t|\boldsymbol{T}(d,r))$ at nodes x in $\mathcal{V}(\boldsymbol{T}(d,r)) \cup \mathcal{F}(\boldsymbol{T}(d,r))$. By construction of the Warning Propagation marks, starting at the root v_0 these can be reconstructed from the bottom up messages. That is, the bottom up messages

contain all the necessary information to define the Waring Propagation marks on $\boldsymbol{T}(d,r)$. The key feature of the bottom up messages $\mu_{x\uparrow}(t|\boldsymbol{T}(d,r))$ is that they are independent of the part of $\boldsymbol{T}(d,r)$ above x, i.e. they are determined by the subtree of $\boldsymbol{T}(d,r)$ pending on x. By the recursive structure of $\boldsymbol{T}(d,r)$ conditioned on the structure of $\boldsymbol{T}(d,r)$ above a variable node v the bottom up message at v has the same distribution as the message $\mu_{v_0\uparrow}(t|\boldsymbol{T}(d,r))$ at the root v_0. This behavior makes it much easier to first describe the limiting distribution of $\boldsymbol{T}(d,r)$ marked with these bottom up messages $\mu_{x\uparrow}(t|\boldsymbol{T}(d,r))$, i.e.

$$\theta^s_{d,r,k,t} := \mathcal{L}(\partial^s[\boldsymbol{T}(d,r), v_0, \mu_{\,\cdot\,\uparrow}(t|\boldsymbol{T}(d,r))]).$$

Using Lemma 3.2 and the recursive structure of $\boldsymbol{T}(d,r)$ we can conjecture a possible limit distribution for $\theta^s_{d,r,k,t}$ as $t\to\infty$. Lemma 3.2 suggests to assume that the pointwise limits of the bottom up messages $\mu_{v\uparrow}(t|\boldsymbol{T}(d,r))$ at variable nodes $v\in\mathcal{V}(\boldsymbol{T}(d,r))$ exist. We first apply this to the case that s is even. Once we condition on the isomorphism class $\partial^s[\boldsymbol{T}(d,r)]$ of the tree up to level s, the messages $\lim_{t\to\infty}\mu_{x\uparrow}(t|\boldsymbol{T}(d,r))$ for nodes x at distance less than s from the root v_0 are determined by the boundary messages $\lim_{t\to\infty}\mu_{v\uparrow}(t|\boldsymbol{T}(d,r))$ sent out by the variable nodes at distance precisely s from v_0. Furthermore, the limit $\lim_{t\to\infty}\mu_{v\uparrow}(t|\boldsymbol{T}(d,r))$ is determined by the tree pending on v only. These trees are mutually independent copies of $\boldsymbol{T}(d,r)$. Thus, Lemma 3.2 suggests that the "boundary messages" converge to a sequence of mutually independent $\mathrm{Be}(p^*)$ variables. Therefore, we can conjecture that $\theta^s_{d,r,k,t}$ converges to the random $\{0,1\}$-marked tree which is obtained as follows. Create the first s levels of the random tree $\boldsymbol{T}(d,r)$ (without markings), then create a sequence of independent $\mathrm{Be}(p^*)$ random variables. Plug in these "messages" at level s and pass them up to the root.

If s is odd the nodes at distance precisely s from the root v_0 are factor nodes and thus Lemma 3.2 does not apply to the messages at these nodes. Still, conditioning on the isomorphism class $\partial^{s+1}[\boldsymbol{T}(d,r)]$ we can apply the same argument for the variable nodes at distance $s+1$ from the root. In this case, one would create the first $s+1$ levels of $\boldsymbol{T}(d,r)$ marking each variable node at distance $s+1$ by a $\mathrm{Be}(p^*)$ "message" and pass the messages up to the root.

To define this distribution formally, let T be a locally finite acyclic factor graph rooted at $v_0\in\mathcal{V}(T)$ and let $s>0$ be an integer. Moreover, let $\beta=(\beta_w)_{w\in\mathcal{V}(T)}$ be a family of independent $\mathrm{Be}(p^*)$ random variables. If either $t=0$ or if v is a variable node at distance greater than s from v_0, we define

$$\mu^*_{v\uparrow}(t|T,s)=\beta_v. \tag{4.1}$$

If a is a factor node in T

$$\mu^*_{a\uparrow}(0|T,s)=1. \tag{4.2}$$

Moreover, if $t>0$ and if a is a factor node in T

$$\mu^*_{a\uparrow}(t|T,s)=\mathbf{1}\left\{\sum_{v\in\partial^+ v}\mu^*_{v\uparrow}(t-1|T,s)=r-1\right\}. \tag{4.3}$$

Finally, if $t>0$ and if v has distance less than or equal to s from v_0, let

$$\mu^*_{v\uparrow}(t|T,s)=\mathbf{1}\left\{\sum_{a\in\partial^+ v}\mu^*_{a\uparrow}(t-1|T,s)\geq k-1\right\}. \tag{4.4}$$

Let us denote the map $x\mapsto\mu^*_{x\uparrow}(t|T,s)$ by $\mu^*_{\,\cdot\,\uparrow}(t|T,s)$.

Lemma 4.1. *Let $0 < s < u$. We have $\mathcal{L}(\partial^s[\boldsymbol{T}(d,r), v_0, \mu^*_{\cdot\uparrow}(s|\boldsymbol{T}(d,r),s)]) = \mathcal{L}(\partial^s[\boldsymbol{T}(d,r), v_0, \mu^*_{\cdot\uparrow}(u|\boldsymbol{T}(d,r),s)])$.*

Proof. By construction, the messages $\mu^*_{x\uparrow}(s|\boldsymbol{T}(d,r),s)$ in $\boldsymbol{T}(d,r)$ remain fixed after s iterations of the update rules (4.1) – (4.4). □

The main result of this subsection is the following.

Lemma 4.2. *We have $\lim_{t\to\infty}\theta^s_{d,r,k,t} = \theta^{s,*}_{d,r,k}$ for all $s \geq 0$.*

Proof. We will distinguish between the cases that s is even and odd. If s is even, let $0 < \varepsilon < 1/10$. We couple the distributions of $\partial^s[\boldsymbol{T}(d,r), v_0, \mu_{\cdot\uparrow}(t|\boldsymbol{T}(d,r))]$ and $\partial^s[\boldsymbol{T}(d,r), v_0, \mu^*_{\cdot\uparrow}(s|\boldsymbol{T}(d,r),s)]$ such that both operate on the same tree $\boldsymbol{T}(d,r)$. To this end, let $\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{B}(s)$ be the set of all variable nodes of the random tree $\boldsymbol{T}(d,r)$ that have distance precisely s from v_0 and let $\mathcal{E} = \{\mu_{v\uparrow}(t|\boldsymbol{T}(d,r)) = \beta_v \forall t > t_1, v \in \mathcal{B}\}$. If the event $\mathcal{E}$ occurs, then the initialization $\mu^*_{v\uparrow}(t|\boldsymbol{T}(d,r),s) = \beta_v$ for $v \in \mathcal{B}$ (cf. (4.1)), and (4.4) ensure that

$$\mu^*_{u\uparrow}(s|\boldsymbol{T}(d,r),s) = \mu^*_{u\uparrow}(t|\boldsymbol{T}(d,r),s) = \mu_{u\uparrow}(t|\boldsymbol{T}(d,r)) \qquad \text{for all } t > t_1 + s.$$

On the other hand it holds that $\mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{T}(d,r)}[|\mathcal{B}|]$ is bounded. This implies that there exists $C = C(d,r,k,\varepsilon) > 0$ such that

$$\mathbb{P}\left[|\mathcal{B}| \leq C\right] > 1 - \varepsilon/2. \tag{4.5}$$

Now, let $\beta = (\beta_v)_{v\in\mathcal{B}}$ be a family of mutually independent $\mathrm{Be}(p^*)$ random variables. Given the sub-tree $\partial^s[\boldsymbol{T}(d,r), v_0]$, the trees $\boldsymbol{T}_v$ pending on the variable nodes $v \in \mathcal{B}$ are mutually independent and have the same distribution as the tree $\boldsymbol{T}(d,r)$ itself. Therefore, Lemma 3.2 implies that given $|\mathcal{B}| \leq C$ there exist $t_1 = t_1(d,r,k,\varepsilon)$ and a coupling of β with the trees $(\boldsymbol{T}_v)_{v\in\mathcal{B}}$ such that

$$\mathbb{P}\left[\mu_{v\uparrow}(t|\boldsymbol{T}(d,r)) = \beta_v \forall t > t_1, v \in \mathcal{B} \;\middle|\; |\mathcal{B}| \leq C\right] > 1 - \varepsilon/2. \tag{4.6}$$

Hence, (4.5) and (4.6) yield

$$\mathbb{P}\left[\partial^s[\boldsymbol{T}(d,r), v_0, \mu_{\cdot\uparrow}(t|\boldsymbol{T}(d,r))] = \partial^s[\boldsymbol{T}(d,r), v_0, \mu^*_{\cdot\uparrow}(s|\boldsymbol{T}(d,r),s)]\right] > 1 - \varepsilon,$$

as desired. If s is odd we apply the same argument to the set $\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{B}(s+1)$ of variable nodes at distance precisely $s+1$ from the root. □

4.2. **Turning the tables.** The aim of this section is to introduce a top-down process that matches the distribution $\theta^*_{d,r,k}$. To this end, let $\boldsymbol{T}^*(d,r,k)$ be the random $\{0,1\}$-marked acyclic factor graph defined as follows. Recall that $c = c(d,r) = d/(r-1)!$. Initially, $\boldsymbol{T}^*(d,r,k)$ consists of a root v_0 which is marked with 1 with probability p^* and 0 otherwise. Starting at v_0, every variable node of type 0 has a $\mathrm{Po}\left(c(1-p^{*r-1})\right)$ number of factor node children of type 0 and an independent $\mathrm{Po}_{<k-1}\left(cp^{*r-1}\right)$ number of factor node children of type 1. Further, a type 1 variable node spawns $\mathrm{Po}\left(c(1-p^{*r-1})\right)$ type 0 offspring and independently $\mathrm{Po}_{\geq k-1}\left(cp^{*r-1}\right)$ type 1 offspring. Each factor node has precisely $r-1$ children. If a factor node is of type 1, then all its children are of type 1 as well. If a factor node is of type 0, then it has a $\mathrm{Bin}_{<r-1}(r-1,p^*)$ number of 1 function node children. The remaining ones are marked with 0. The mark of each vertex v, denote by $\mu^*_{v\uparrow}$, is identical to its type.

Lemma 4.3. *For any $s \geq 0$ we have $\mathcal{L}\left(\partial^s[\boldsymbol{T}^*(d,r,k)]\right) = \theta^{s,*}_{d,r,k}$.*

Proof. Let

$$\mathcal{T}(s,u) = \partial^s[\boldsymbol{T}(d,r), v_0, \mu^*_{\cdot\uparrow}(u|\boldsymbol{T}(d,r),s)], \qquad \mathcal{T}(s) = \partial^s[\boldsymbol{T}^*(d,r,k)]$$

Then our aim is to prove that $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{T}(s,s)) = \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{T}(s))$ for all s. The proof is by induction on s. In the case $s = 0$ both $\mathcal{T}(s)$ and $\mathcal{T}(s,s)$ consist of the root v_0 only, which is marked 1 with probability p^* and 0 otherwise.

Now, assume that $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{T}(s)) = \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{T}(s,s))$ holds for even s. Let $\beta_v = \mu^*_{v\uparrow}(0|\boldsymbol{T}(d), s+2)$ for $v \in \mathcal{B}(s+2)$ be independent $\mathrm{Be}(p^*)$ variables. Further, let $X_v(z)$ be the number of children b of $v \in \mathcal{B}(s)$ such that $\mu^*_{b\uparrow}(1|\boldsymbol{T}(d), s+1) = z$. Clearly, in the random tree $\boldsymbol{T}(d,r)$ the total number of children of $v \in \mathcal{B}(s)$ has distribution $\mathrm{Po}(c)$, and these numbers are mutually independent conditioned on $\partial^s\boldsymbol{T}(d,r)$. Since for each child b we have $\mu^*_{b\uparrow}(1|\boldsymbol{T}(d), s+1) = 1$ with probability p^{*r-1} independently, we obtain that $X_v(z)$ has distribution $\mathrm{Po}(cp^{*r-1})$ if $z = 1$ and distribution $\mathrm{Po}(c(1-p^{*r-1}))$ if $z = 0$. Further, $\mu^*_{v\uparrow}(s+1|\boldsymbol{T}(d,r), s+1) = 1$ iff $X_v(1) \geq k-1$.

Hence, the distribution of $\mathcal{T}(s+1, s+1)$ conditioned on $\mathcal{T}(s, s+1)$ can be described as follows. Conditioned on $\mathcal{T}(s, s+1)$, $(X_u(z))_{u\in\mathcal{B}(s),z\in\{0,1\}}$ are independent random variables. Furthermore, conditioned on $\mu^*_{v\uparrow}(s+1|\boldsymbol{T}(d), s+1) = 1$, $X_v(1)$ has distribution $\mathrm{Po}_{\geq k-1}(cp^{*r-1})$. Given $\mu^*_{v\uparrow}(s+1|\boldsymbol{T}(d,r), s+1) = 0$, $X_v(1)$ has distribution $\mathrm{Po}_{<k-1}(cp^{*r-1})$. In addition, $X_v(0)$ has distribution $\mathrm{Po}(c(1-p^{*r-1}))$ for any v.

Now, let s be odd, i.e. the set $\mathcal{B}(s+1)$ consists of variable nodes. In this case the distribution $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{T}(s+1, s+1))$ can be described as follows. Again, create $\boldsymbol{T}(d,r)$, further let $\beta_v = \mu^*_{v\uparrow}(0|\boldsymbol{T}(d,r), s+1)$ for $v \in \mathcal{B}(s+1)$ be the boundary messages at level $s+1$. Then $(\beta_v)_{v\in\mathcal{B}(s+1)}$ is a family of independent $\mathrm{Be}(p^*)$ variables. Again, let $X_a(z)$ be the number of children v of $a \in \mathcal{B}(s)$ such that $\beta_v = z$. For each of the $r-1$ children v of a we have $\beta_v = 1$ with probability p^* independently. We see that conditioned on $\partial^s\boldsymbol{T}(d,r)$ the random variables $(X_a(z))_{a\in\mathcal{B}(s),z\in\{0,1\}}$ are mutually independent. Moreover, $X_a(1)$ has distribution $\mathrm{Bin}(r-1, p^*)$ and $X_a(0) = r-1-X_a(1)$. Further, $\mu^*_{a\uparrow}(s+1|\boldsymbol{T}(d), s+1) = 1$ iff $X_a(1) = r-1$.

Therefore, given $\mu^*_{a\uparrow}(s+1|\boldsymbol{T}(d), s+1) = 1$, $X_a(1) = r-1$ and $X_a(0) = 0$. In addition, given $\mu^*_{a\uparrow}(s+1|\boldsymbol{T}(d), s+1) = 0$, $X_a(1)$ has distribution $\mathrm{Bin}_{<r-1}(r-1, p^*)$ and $X_a(0) = r-1-X_a(1)$ for any a.

Therefore, the distribution of the random variables $(X_x(z))_{x\in\mathcal{B}(s),z\in\{0,1\}}$ conditioned on $\mathcal{T}(s, s+1)$ coincides with the offspring distribution of the tree $\boldsymbol{T}^*(d,r,k)$ for all $s \geq 0$. Since $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{T}(s, s+1)) = \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{T}(s,s)) = \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{T}(s))$ by Lemma 4.1 and induction, the assertion follows. □

4.3. **Exchanging messages both ways.** Lemmas 4.2 and 4.3 show that the labels $\mu^*_{x\uparrow}$ of $\boldsymbol{T}^*(d,r,k)$ correspond to the "upward messages" that are sent toward the root in the tree $\boldsymbol{T}(d,r)$. Of course, in the tree $\boldsymbol{T}(d,r)$ the marks $\mu_x(t|\boldsymbol{T}(d,r))$ can be computed from the messages $\mu_{x\uparrow}(t|\boldsymbol{T}(d,r))$. For the root we have

$$\mu_{v_0}(t|\boldsymbol{T}(d)) = \mathbf{1}\left\{\sum_{b\in\partial v_0}\mu_{b\uparrow}(t|\boldsymbol{T}(d)) \geq k\right\} \qquad \text{for all } t \geq 0.$$

That is, the Warning Propagation mark at the root does only depend on the messages that v_0 receives from its children in $\boldsymbol{T}(d,r)$. This is certainly not the case for the remaining Warning Propagation marks in $\boldsymbol{T}(d,r)$, since each node beside

the root receives an additional message from its parent in the tree. These "top-down"-messages can recursively be determined from the messages $\mu_{x\uparrow}(t|\boldsymbol{T}(d,r))$ as follows. For the root we simply have

$$\mu_{\downarrow v_0}(t|\boldsymbol{T}(d,r)) = 0 \qquad \text{for all } t \geq 0. \tag{4.7}$$

For every node x we initialize $\mu_{x\downarrow}(0|\boldsymbol{T}(d,r)) = 1$. Now, assume that u is the parent of some factor node a in $\boldsymbol{T}(d,r)$. Then we let $\mu_{\downarrow a}(t+1|\boldsymbol{T}(d,r)) = \mu_{u\to a}(t+1|\boldsymbol{T}(d,r))$, i.e.

$$\mu_{\downarrow a}(t+1|\boldsymbol{T}(d,r)) = \mathbf{1}\left\{\mu_{\downarrow u}(t|\boldsymbol{T}(d,r)) + \sum_{b\in\partial^+ u\setminus a}\mu_{b\uparrow}(t|\boldsymbol{T}(d,r)) \geq k-1\right\} \tag{4.8}$$

for $t \geq 0$. If now b is the parent of some variable node v, similarly we let $\mu_{\downarrow v}(t+1|\boldsymbol{T}(d,r)) = \mu_{b\to v}(t+1|\boldsymbol{T}(d,r))$. That is

$$\mu_{\downarrow v}(t+1|\boldsymbol{T}(d,r)) = \mathbf{1}\left\{\mu_{\downarrow b}(t|\boldsymbol{T}(d,r)) + \sum_{w\in\partial^+ b\setminus v}\mu_{w\uparrow}(t|\boldsymbol{T}(d,r)) = r-1\right\} \tag{4.9}$$

for $t \geq 0$. Finally,

$$\mu_a(t|\boldsymbol{T}(d)) = \mathbf{1}\left\{\mu_{\downarrow a}(t|\boldsymbol{T}(d,r)) + \sum_{w\in\partial^+ a}\mu_{w\uparrow}(t|\boldsymbol{T}(d,r)) = r-1\right\}$$

and

$$\mu_v(t|\boldsymbol{T}(d,r)) = \mathbf{1}\left\{\mu_{\downarrow v}(t|\boldsymbol{T}(d,r)) + \sum_{b\in\partial^+ v}\mu_{b\uparrow}(t|\boldsymbol{T}(d,r)) \geq k\right\}$$

for $t \geq 0$.

As a next step we will mimic this construction to introduce "top-down" messages and marks on the random tree $\boldsymbol{T}^*(d,r,k)$. To this end, we set $\mu^*_{\downarrow v_0} = 0$ and

$$\mu^*_{v_0} = \mathbf{1}\left\{\sum_{a\in\partial v_0}\mu^*_{a\uparrow} \geq k\right\}.$$

Further, assume that $\mu^*_{\downarrow u}$ has been defined already and that u is the parent of some factor node a. Then we let

$$\mu^*_{\downarrow a} = \mathbf{1}\left\{\mu^*_{\downarrow u} + \sum_{b\in\partial^+ u\setminus a}\mu^*_{b\uparrow} \geq k-1\right\} \tag{4.10}$$

and

$$\mu^*_a = \mathbf{1}\left\{\mu^*_{\downarrow a} + \sum_{w\in\partial^+ a}\mu^*_{w\uparrow} = r\right\} \tag{4.11}$$

Similarly, assume that $\mu^*_{\downarrow a}$ has been defined already and that a is the parent of a variable node v. Then we let

$$\mu^*_{\downarrow v} = \mathbf{1}\left\{\mu^*_{\downarrow a} + \sum_{w\in\partial^+ a\setminus v}\mu^*_{w\uparrow} = r-1\right\} \tag{4.12}$$

and

$$\mu^*_v = \mathbf{1}\left\{\mu^*_{\downarrow v} + \sum_{b\in\partial^+ v}\mu^*_{b\uparrow} \geq k\right\}. \tag{4.13}$$

Let $\hat{\boldsymbol{T}}^*(d,r,k)$ signify the resulting tree in which each node x is marked by the triple $(\mu^*_x, \mu^*_{x\uparrow}, \mu^*_{\downarrow x})$. We observe that by the above definitions it holds that

$$(\mu^*_v, \mu^*_{v\uparrow}, \mu^*_{\downarrow v}) \in \{(0,0,0),(0,0,1),(0,1,0),(1,1,0),(1,1,1)\}$$

for all variable nodes v and

$$(\mu^*_a, \mu^*_{a\uparrow}, \mu^*_{\downarrow a}) \in \{(0,0,0),(0,0,1),(0,1,0),(1,1,1)\}$$

for all factor nodes a.

Lemma 4.4. *For any $s>0$ we have $\lim_{t\to\infty}\mathcal{L}(\partial^s\hat{\boldsymbol{T}}_t(d,r,k)) = \mathcal{L}(\partial^s\hat{\boldsymbol{T}}^*(d,r,k))$.*

Proof. This is immediate from Lemma 4.2, Lemma 4.3 and the fact that the definitions (4.7)–(4.9) and (4.10) and (4.12) of the "top-down" messages for $\hat{\boldsymbol{T}}_t(d,r,k)$ and $\hat{\boldsymbol{T}}^*(d,r,k)$ match. □

4.4. **Proof of the main theorem.** Finally, we show that the tree $\hat{\boldsymbol{T}}^*(d,r,k)$ has the same distribution as the 9-type branching process from § 1.2.

Lemma 4.5. *We have $\mathcal{L}(\hat{\boldsymbol{T}}^*(d,r,k)) = \mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{T}(d,r,k,p^*))$.*

Proof. We show that $\mathcal{L}(\partial^s[\hat{\boldsymbol{T}}^*(d,r,k)]) = \mathcal{L}(\partial^s[\hat{\boldsymbol{T}}(d,r,k,p^*)])$ for any $s\geq 0$ by induction on s. Let $\mathcal{F}_s$ be the σ-algebra generated by the $\{0,1\}$-marked tree $\partial^s\boldsymbol{T}^*(d,r,k)$. In addition, let $\hat{\mathcal{F}}_s$ be the σ-algebra generated by $\partial^s\hat{\boldsymbol{T}}^*(d,r,k)$. Given $\partial^s\boldsymbol{T}^*(d,r,k)$ including the marks, by construction one can construct the missing bits of the types of vertices in $\partial^s\hat{\boldsymbol{T}}^*(d,r,k)$. On the other hand, given $\partial^s\hat{\boldsymbol{T}}^*(d,r,k)$ we can reconstruct the the marks at level $s+1$ in $\partial^{s+1}\boldsymbol{T}^*(d,r,k)$. Therefore, it holds that

$$\mathcal{F}_s \subset \hat{\mathcal{F}}_s \subset \mathcal{F}_{s+1} \qquad \text{for any } s\geq 0. \tag{4.14}$$

With respect to $s=0$, we see that $\mu^*_{\downarrow v_0}=0$ with certainty. Moreover, $\mu^*_{v_0\uparrow}$ has distribution $\mathrm{Be}(p^*)$ and $\mu^*_{v_0}=0$ if $\mu^*_{v_0\uparrow}=0$. On the other hand, conditioned on that $\mu^*_{v_0\uparrow}=1$, v_0 has at least $k-1$ children a such that $\mu^*_{a\uparrow}=1$. Therefore, $\sum_{a\in\partial v_0}\mu^*_{a\uparrow}$ has distribution $\mathrm{Po}_{\geq k-1}(cp^{*r-1})$, and $\mu^*_{v_0}=1$ iff $\sum_{a\in\partial v_0}\mu^*_{a\uparrow}\geq k$. Hence, using the fixed point property $p^*=\mathbb{P}\left[\mathrm{Po}(cp^{*r-1})\geq k-1\right]$ and (1.1) with $q=q(d,k,p^*)$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}\left[(\mu^*_{v_0},\mu^*_{v_0\uparrow},\mu^*_{\downarrow v_0})=000\right] &= \mathbb{P}\left[\mathrm{Po}(cp^{*r-1})<k-1\right] = 1-p^* = p_{000},\\
\mathbb{P}\left[(\mu^*_{v_0},\mu^*_{v_0\uparrow},\mu^*_{\downarrow v_0})=010\right] &= \mathbb{P}\left[\mathrm{Po}(cp^{*r-1})=k-1\right] = p^*q = p_{010},\\
\mathbb{P}\left[(\mu^*_{v_0},\mu^*_{v_0\uparrow},\mu^*_{\downarrow v_0})=110\right] &= \mathbb{P}\left[\mathrm{Po}(cp^{*r-1})\geq k\right] = p^*(1-q) = p_{110}.
\end{aligned}$$

To proceed from s to $s+1$ we will determine the distribution of $\partial^{s+2}[\boldsymbol{T}^*(d,r,k)]$ conditioned on $\hat{\mathcal{F}}_s$. This is sufficient to determine the distribution of $\boldsymbol{T}^*(d,r,k)$ given $\hat{\mathcal{F}}_{s+1}$. To this end, let $\mathcal{B}_s$ be the set of all nodes x at level s in $\boldsymbol{T}^*(d,r,k)$. Moreover, for each $x\in\mathcal{B}_s$ let $\tau_x=(\tau_x(z_1,z_2,z_3))_{z_1,z_2,z_3\in\{0,1\}}$ be the number of children of x marked $z_1z_2z_3$. In addition, let $\tau_x(z_2)$ be the number of children that send a messages of type z_2 to x.

We will show that the the distribution of $\tau_x(z_1, z_2, z_3)$ coincides with the offspring distributions defined in Figures 1 and 2. To begin with, we observe that conditioned on $\hat{\mathcal{F}}_s$ the random variables $(\tau_x)_{x\in\mathcal{B}_s}$ are mutually independent. Furthermore, the distribution of τ_x is determined by the type $(\mu^*_x, \mu^*_{x\uparrow}, \mu^*_{\downarrow x})$ of x. To prove that the distribution of τ_x is given by the generating functions we consider each possible case one after the other. Recall that factor nodes in $\hat{\boldsymbol{T}}(d, r, k, p^*)$ and $\hat{\boldsymbol{T}}^*(d, r, k)$ are of possible types $\{000, 001, 010, 111\}$ and variable nodes in both trees are of possible types $\{000, 001, 010, 110, 111\}$.

We begin with the case that s is odd, i.e. $\mathcal{B}(s)$ is a set of factor nodes.

Case 1: $(\mu^*_a, \mu^*_{a\uparrow}, \mu^*_{\downarrow a}) = (0, 0, 0)$**::** Since $\mu^*_{a\downarrow} = 0$ by (4.12) we have $\mu^*_{\downarrow v} = 0$ for all children v of a. Further, since $\mu^*_{a\uparrow} = 0$, we know that $\tau_a(1) < r - 1$. Thus, $\tau_a(1)$ has distribution $\mathrm{Bin}_{<r-1}(r - 1, p^*)$. Since a has exactly $r - 1$ children we have $\tau_a(0) = \tau_a(0, 0, 0) = r - 1 - \tau_a(1)$. Further, given that v is a child a such that $\mu^*_{v\uparrow} = 1$, we have $\mu^*_v = 1$ iff v has at least k children b such that $\mu^*_{b\uparrow} = 1$ (because $\mu^*_{v\downarrow} = 0$). This event occurs with probability $1 - q$ independently for each v. Hence, given $\tau_a(1)$ we have $\tau_a(0, 1, 0) = \mathrm{Bin}(\tau_a(1), q)$ and $\tau_a(1, 1, 0) = \tau_a(1) - \tau(0, 1, 0)$. In summary, we obtain the generating function f_{000}.

Case 2: $(\mu^*_a, \mu^*_{a\uparrow}, \mu^*_{\downarrow a}) = (0, 0, 1)$**::** there are two sub-cases.

Case 2a: $\tau_a(1) = r - 2$**::** Then for any child w of a we have $\mu^*_{\downarrow w} = 1 - \mu^*_{w\uparrow}$. Therefore a has exactly one child of type $(0, 0, 1)$ and $r-2$ children of type $(1, 1, 0)$ or $(0, 1, 0)$. Hence, for each of the $r-2$ children w such that $\mu^*_{w\uparrow} = 1$ we have $\mu^*_w = 1$ iff w has at least k children b such that $\mu^*_{b\uparrow} = 1$. Thus, $\mu^*_w = \mathrm{Be}(1 - q)$ independently for all each such w.

Case 2b: $\tau_a(1) < r - 2$**::** We have $\mu^*_{\downarrow w} = 0$ for all children w of a. Hence, $\tau_a(0) = \tau_a(0, 0, 0)$. Further, $\tau_v(1)$ has distribution $\mathrm{Bin}_{<r-2}(r - 1, p^*)$ and $\tau_a(0) = r - 1 - \tau_a(1)$. Finally, since $\mu^*_{\downarrow w} = 0$ for all w, any child w such that $\mu^*_{w\uparrow} = 1$ satisfies $\mu^*_w = 1$ iff w has at least k children b such that $\mu^*_{b\uparrow} = 1$. This event occurs with probability $1 - q$ independently for all such w.

Since the first sub-case occurs with probability $\tilde{q}$ and the second one accordingly with probability $1 - \tilde{q}$, we obtain the generating function f_{001}.

Case 3: $(\mu^*_a, \mu^*_{a\uparrow}, \mu^*_{\downarrow a}) = (0, 1, 0)$**::** because $\mu^*_{a\uparrow} = 1$, we have $\tau_a(1) = r - 1$ with certainty. Using $\mu_{a\downarrow} = 0$, we obtain $\mu^*_{w\downarrow} = 0$ for all children w of a. Therefore all children are of type $(0, 1, 0)$ or $(1, 1, 0)$ and if w is a child such that $\mu^*_{w\uparrow} = 1$, then $\mu^*_w = 1$ iff w has at least k children b such that $\mu^*_{b\uparrow} = 1$. This event occurs with probability $1-q$ for each w independently. Consequently, $\tau_v(0) = 0$ and $\tau_v(1) = \tau_v(1, 1, 0) + \tau_v(0, 1, 0) = r - 1$ and $\tau_v(1, 1, 0) = \mathrm{Bin}(r - 1, 1 - q)$. Thus, the offspring distribution of a is given by f_{010}.

Case 4: $(\mu^*_a, \mu^*_{a\uparrow}, \mu^*_{\downarrow a}) = (1, 1, 1)$**::** Since $\mu^*_{a\uparrow} = 1$ we know that $\tau_a(1) = r-1$. Since $\mu^*_a = 1$, it holds that $\mu^*_{w\downarrow} = 1$ for all children w of a. In summary, a has exactly $r - 1$ children of type $(1, 1, 1)$ and the distribution of the offspring of a is given by f_{111}.

We proceed with the same analysis for even s, i.e. $\mathcal{B}(s)$ is a set of variable nodes.

Case 1: $(\mu^*_v, \mu^*_{v\uparrow}, \mu^*_{\downarrow v}) = (0, 0, 0)$**::** Using , $\mu^*_{v\uparrow} = \mu^*_{\downarrow v} = 0$ and (4.10) we have $\mu^*_{\downarrow b} = 0$ for all children b of v. Further, since $\mu^*_{v\uparrow} = 0$, we know that

$\tau_v(1) < k-1$. Thus, $\tau_v(1) = \tau_v(0,1,0)$ has distribution $\mathrm{Po}_{<k-1}\left(cp^{*r-1}\right)$ independent of $\tau_v(0)$. Furthermore, $\tau_v(0) = \tau_v(0,0,0)$ has distribution $\mathrm{Po}\left(c\left(1-p^{*r-1}\right)\right)$. In summary, we obtain the generating function g_{000}.

Case 2: $(\mu^*_v, \mu^*_{v\uparrow}, \mu^*_{\downarrow v}) = (0,0,1)$**::** there are two sub-cases.

Case 2a: $\tau_v(1) = k-2$**::** Then for any child b of v we have $\mu^*_{\downarrow b} = 1-\mu^*_{b\uparrow}$. With $\tau_v(1) = \tau_v(0,1,0)$ we obtain, that v has $k-2$ children of this type. Furthermore, $\tau_v(0) = \tau_v(0,0,1)$ is an independent random variable with distribution $\mathrm{Po}\left(c\left(1-p^{*r-1}\right)\right)$.

Case 2b: $\tau_v(1) < k-2$**::** We have $\mu^*_{\downarrow b} = 0$ for all children b of v. Hence, $\tau_v(0) = \tau_v(0,0,0)$ has distribution $\mathrm{Po}\left(c\left(1-p^{*r-1}\right)\right)$ Further, $\tau_v(1) = \tau_v(0,1,0)$ has distribution $\mathrm{Po}_{<k-2}(cp^*)$ and is independent of $\tau_v(0)$.

Since the first sub-case occurs with probability $\bar{q}$ and the second one accordingly with probability $1-\bar{q}$, we obtain the generating function f_{001}.

Case 3: $(\mu^*_v, \mu^*_{v\uparrow}, \mu^*_{\downarrow v}) = 010$**::** Because $\mu^*_v = 0$ and $\mu^*_{\uparrow v} = 1$, we have $\tau_v(1) = k-1$ with certainty. Further, because $\mu^*_{\downarrow v} = 0$ and $\tau_v(1) = k-1$, (4.10) entails that $\mu^*_{\downarrow b} = 1-\mu_{b\uparrow}$ for all children b of v. Hence, $\tau(0) = \tau(0,0,1) = \mathrm{Po}\left(c\left(1-p^{*r-1}\right)\right)$ and $\tau_v(1) = \tau_v(0,1,0) = k-1$. Thus, the offspring distribution of v is given by g_{010}.

Case 4: $(\mu^*_v, \mu^*_{v\uparrow}, \mu^*_{\downarrow v}) = 110$**::** Since $\mu^*_v = 1$, (4.10) entails that $\mu^*_{\downarrow b} = 1$ for all children b of v. Hence $\tau_v(0) = \tau_v(0,0,1)$ and $\tau_v(1) = \tau_v(1,1,1) \geq k$. Consequently, $\tau_v(1)$ has distribution $\mathrm{Po}_{\geq k}\left(cp^{*r-1}\right)$ independently of $\tau_v(0)$ with distribution $\mathrm{Po}\left(c\left(1-p^{*r-1}\right)\right)$. Thus, we obtain g_{110}.

Case 5: $(\mu^*_v, \mu^*_{v\uparrow}, \mu^*_{\downarrow v}) = 111$**::** As in the previous case, $\mu^*_v = 1$, (4.10) ensures that $\mu^*_{\downarrow b} = 1$ for all children b of v. Thus, $\tau_v(0) = \tau_v(0,0,1)$. Furthermore, as $\mu^*_v = \mu^*_{\downarrow v} = 1$, $\tau_v(1) = \tau_v(1,1,1)$ has distribution $\mathrm{Po}_{\geq k-1}(cp^{*r-1})$. In summary, the distribution of the offspring of v is given by g_{111}.

Thus, in every possible case the distribution of τ_x coincides with the offspring distributions determined by the generating functions in Figures 1 and 2. □

Proof of Theorem 1.2.
By Proposition 3.3 we have

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \Lambda_{d,r,k,n} = \delta_{\theta_{d,r,k}} \quad \text{and} \quad \theta_{d,r,k} = \lim_{t\to\infty} \mathcal{L}([\boldsymbol{T}_t(d,r,k)]).$$

Moreover, combining Lemmas 4.2, 4.3, 4.4 and 4.5, we see that $\theta_{d,r,k} = \vartheta_{d,r,k,p^*}$.

Proof of Theorem 1.1.
Let $s \geq 0$ and let τ be a $\{0,1\}$-marked rooted acyclic factor graph. The function $f = \kappa_{\tau,s}$ is continuous, and we let

$$z = \mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{T}(d,r,k,p^*)}[f([\boldsymbol{T}(d,r,k,p^*)])] = \mathbb{P}\left[\partial^s[\boldsymbol{T}(d,r,k,p^*)] = \partial^s[\tau]\right].$$

Since $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{G}_{\{0,1\}})$ is equipped with the weak topology, the function

$$F : \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{G}_{\{0,1\}}) \to \mathbb{R}, \qquad \xi \mapsto \left|\int f \mathrm{d}\nu - z\right|,$$

is continuous as well. Furthermore, Theorem 1.2 implies that $\Lambda_{d,r,k,n}$ converges to $\delta_{\vartheta_{d,r,k,p^*}}$ weakly in $\mathcal{P}^2(\mathcal{G}_{\{0,1\}})$, i.e.

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\int F\mathrm{d}\Lambda_{d,r,k,n}=\left|\int f\mathrm{d}\vartheta_{d,r,k,p^*}-z\right|=|\mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{T}(d,k,p^*)}[f([\boldsymbol{T}(d,r,k,p^*)])]-z|=0. \tag{4.15}$$

Let $X_\tau(\boldsymbol{F})=n^{-1}\left|\{v\in[n]:\partial^s[\boldsymbol{F}_v,v,\sigma_{k,\boldsymbol{F}_v}]=\partial^s[\tau]\}\right|$. Plugging in the definition of $\Lambda_{d,r,k,n}$, we obtain

$$\int F\mathrm{d}\Lambda_{d,r,k,n}=\mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{F}}\left|X_\tau(\boldsymbol{F})-z\right|.$$

Using (4.15), we obtain that $X_\tau(\boldsymbol{F})$ converges to z in probability.

Appendix A. Proof of Theorem 2.1

Proof. We let

$$X_s=X_s(T,w_0)=\frac{1}{n}\sum_{v\in[n]}\mathbf{1}\left\{\partial^s(\boldsymbol{F},v)\cong\partial^s(T,w_0)\right\}$$

and

$$p_s=p_s(T,w_0)=\mathbb{P}\left[\partial^s(\boldsymbol{T}(d,r),v_0)\cong\partial^s(T,w_0)\right].$$

Our aim is to prove

$$X_s\to p_s\quad\text{in probability as } n \text{ tends to infinity} \tag{A.1}$$

for all $s\geq 0$.

As a first step we prove that the number of short cycles in the factor graph of $\boldsymbol{F}$ is bounded w.h.p.. Therefore let l be constant. To obtain a cycle on $2l$ vertices, i.e. l variable and function nodes respectively, there have to exist l edges on at most $l(r-1)$ vertices in the hypergraph $\boldsymbol{H}$. Let $C_n(l)$ denote the number of such subgraphs in $\boldsymbol{H}$, then

$$\mathbb{E}\left[C_n\right]=\binom{n}{l(r-1)}\binom{\binom{l(r-1)}{r}}{l}p^l=\Theta(1)$$

and

$$\mathbb{E}\left[C_n(l)^2\right]=\sum_{x=0}^{l}\binom{n}{2l(r-1)-xr}\binom{\binom{2l(r-1)-xr}{r}}{l}p^{2l-x}=\mathrm{O}\left(\frac{1}{n}\right).$$

Therefore we can use $\mathrm{Var}(C_n(l))=O\left(\frac{1}{n}\right)$ to apply Chebyshev's inequality which implies $\mathbb{P}\left(|C_n(l)-\mathbb{E}\left[C_n(l)\right]|\geq n^{-1/4}\right)\leq n^{-1/2}=\mathrm{o}(1)$. We conclude that the number of cycles of length l in $\boldsymbol{F}$ is bounded w.h.p.

We proceed with proving the assertion (A.1) for even distances from the root. Therefor, we let $s=2t$. Our aim is to prove that X_{2t} converges to p_{2t} in probability. The proof proceeds by induction on t. For $t=0$ there is nothing to show, because $\partial^{2t}(\boldsymbol{F},v)$ only consists of v. To proceed from t to $t+1$, let m denote the number of children $a_1,\dots,a_m$ of w_0 in T. For each $1\leq i\leq m$ and $1\leq l\leq r-1$ let $T_i^{(l)}$ denote the tree rooted at the l-th child $v_i^{(l)}$ of a_i in T in the forest obtained by deleting w_0 from T. Finally, for some $\tilde{r}_i\leq r-1$ let $C_i^1,\dots,C_i^{(\tilde{r}_i)}$ denote the distinct isomorphism classes among $\{\partial^{2t}(\boldsymbol{T}_i^{(l)},v_i^{(l)}):l\leq r-1\}$ and let $s_i^{(j)}=|\{l\leq r-1:\partial^{2t}(\boldsymbol{T}_i^{(l)},v_i^{(l)})\in C_i^j\}|$. Let v be an arbitrary variable node in $\boldsymbol{F}$. Our

aim is to determine the probability of the event that $\partial^{2(t+1)}(\boldsymbol{F}, v)$ is isomorphic to $\partial^{2t}(T, w_0)$. For that reason we think of $\boldsymbol{H}$ being created in two rounds. First we insert every possible edge in $[n] \setminus v$ with probability p independently. Then we complete subset of cardinality $r-1$ of $[n] \setminus v$ to an edge with v with probability p independently. For the above event to happen v must be contained in exactly m edges. The number of edges that contain v is binomial distributed with parameters $\binom{n}{r-1}$ and p. Since $\binom{n}{r-1}p \to \frac{d}{(r-1)!}$ as n tends to infinity, we can approximate this number with a Poisson distribution, and v is contained in the right number of edges with probability

$$\frac{c^m}{m! \exp(c)} + \mathrm{o}(1).$$

The number of cycles of length $4t+4$ in $\boldsymbol{F}$ is bounded w.h.p., all the pairwise distances between factor nodes connected to v in the factor graph are at least $4t+2$. Thus, conditioned on v having the right degree, by induction v forms an edge with exactly $s_j^{(l)}$ vertices with neighbourhood isomorphic to $\partial^{2t}(\boldsymbol{T}_i^{(l)}, v_i^{(l)}) \in C_i^j$ with probability

$$\binom{r-1}{s_j^{(1)}, \dots, s_j^{(\tilde{r}_j)}} \prod_{i=1}^{\tilde{r}_j} p_t(C_j^{(i)}) + \mathrm{o}(1)$$

independently for all c edges a_j. Therefore

$$\mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{F}}[X_{2(t+1)}] = \frac{(c)^m}{m! \exp(c)} \prod_{j=1}^{m} \left(\binom{r-1}{s_j^{(1)}, \dots, s_j^{(\tilde{r}_j)}} \prod_{i=1}^{\tilde{r}_j} p_{2t}(C_j^{(i)}) \right) + \mathrm{o}(1).$$

By definition of $\boldsymbol{T}(d, r)$, we obtain $\mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{F}}[X_{2(t+1)}] = p_{t+1} + \mathrm{o}(1)$. As a next step we determine $\mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{F}}[X_{2(t+1)}^2]$ to apply Chebyshev's inequality. Let $\boldsymbol{v}, \boldsymbol{w} \in [n]$ be two randomly chosen vertices. Then w.h.p. $\boldsymbol{v}$ and $\boldsymbol{w}$ have distance at least $4t+4$ in the factor graph $\boldsymbol{F}$, conditioned on which $\partial^{2(t+1)}(\boldsymbol{F}, \boldsymbol{v})$ and $\partial^{2(t+1)}(\boldsymbol{F}, \boldsymbol{w})$ are independent. Therefore, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{P}_{\boldsymbol{v},\boldsymbol{w}} \left(\partial^{2(t+1)}(\boldsymbol{F}, \boldsymbol{v}) \cong \partial^{2(t+1)}(T, w_0) \wedge \partial^{2(t+1)}(\boldsymbol{F}, \boldsymbol{w}) \cong \partial^{2(t+1)}(T, w_0) \right) \\
&= \mathbb{P}_{\boldsymbol{v}} \left(\partial^{2(t+1)}(\boldsymbol{F}, \boldsymbol{v}) \cong \partial^{2(t+1)}(T, w_0) \right) \mathbb{P}_{\boldsymbol{w}} \left(\partial^{2(t+1)}(\boldsymbol{F}, \boldsymbol{w}) \cong \partial^{2(t+1)}(T, w_0) \right) + \mathrm{o}(1)
\end{aligned}$$

And finally

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{F}}[X_{2(t+1)}^2] \\
&\quad = \mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{F}} \left[\mathbb{P}_{\boldsymbol{v}} \left(\partial^{2(t+1)}(\boldsymbol{F}, \boldsymbol{v}) \cong \partial^{2(t+1)}(T, w_0) \right) \mathbb{P}_{\boldsymbol{w}} \left(\partial^{2(t+1)}(\boldsymbol{F}, \boldsymbol{w}) \cong \partial^{2(t+1)}(T, w_0) \right) \right] \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{F}}[X_{2(t+1)}] + \mathrm{o}(1) \\
&\quad = \mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{F}}[X_{2(t+1)}]^2 + \mathrm{o}(1).
\end{aligned}$$

Assertion (A.1) follows from Chebyshev's inequality. Since every factor node in $\boldsymbol{F}$ and $\boldsymbol{T}(d, r)$ has degree exactly r the assertion follows for odd t.

To prove the statement of the Theorem it suffices to show that $\int f \mathrm{d}\Lambda_{d,r,n}$ converges to $f(\mathcal{L}([\boldsymbol{T}(d, r)]))$ for every continuous function $f : \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{G}) \to \mathbb{R}$ with bounded support. Since $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{G})$ together with the weak topology is a Polish space, it is metrizable and weak convergence is equivalent to convergence in some metric on $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{G})$.

Assertion (A.1) implies that the distance of $\lambda_{\boldsymbol{F}}$ and $\mathcal{L}([\boldsymbol{T}(d,r)])$ in this metric converges to 0 in probability (as n tends to infinity). Since f is uniformly continuous this implies that $f(\lambda_{\boldsymbol{F}})$ converges to $f(\mathcal{L}([\boldsymbol{T}(d,r)]))$ in probability. Since $f(\lambda_{\boldsymbol{F}})$ is a bounded random variable and $f(\mathcal{L}([\boldsymbol{T}(d,r)])) \in \mathbb{R}$, convergence in probability implies L_1 convergence and we obtain

$$|\mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{F}}[f(\lambda_{\boldsymbol{F}})] - f(\mathcal{L}([\boldsymbol{T}(d,r)]))| \to 0.$$

Plugging in the definition of $\Lambda_{d,r,n}$ we obtain $\int f \mathrm{d}\Lambda_{d,r,n} = \mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{F}}[f(\lambda_{\boldsymbol{F}})]]$, which completes the proof. □

Appendix B. Tables of Definitions

We begin with listing the random acyclic factor graphs defined throughout the paper. $\boldsymbol{T}(d,r)$ is the unmarked recursive acyclic factor graph in which each variable node has $\mathrm{Po}(d/(r-1)!)$ children independently and each factor node has $r-1$ children deterministicly. From $\boldsymbol{T}(d,r)$ we may construct labels on variable and factor nodes *bottom-up* using a variant of Warning Propagation (WP). Note that in all trees defined below it holds that variable nodes are of types $\{000, 001, 010, 110, 111\}$ and factor nodes are of types $\{000, 001, 010, 111\}$.

Table 1. Bottom-up Trees

Tree name	Types	Further description
$\boldsymbol{T}_t(d,r,k)$	$\{0,1\}$	Obtained from $\boldsymbol{T}(d,r)$ after t rounds of WP. Every node is labelled with its WP mark.
$\hat{\boldsymbol{T}}_t(d,r,k)$	$\{000,001,010,110,111\}$	Obtained from $\boldsymbol{T}(d,r)$ after t rounds of 5-type WP. Every node is labelled with the triple of its WP mark, the message to its parent and the message from its parent.

Alternatively, we may construct labels *top-down*, so the labels are constructed simultaneously with the tree.

Table 2. Top-down Trees

Tree name	Types	Further description
$\hat{\boldsymbol{T}}(d,r,k,p)$	$\{000,001,010,110,111\}$	Constructed according to the generating functions of Figures 1 and 2.
$\boldsymbol{T}(d,r,k,p)$	$\{0,1\}$	2-type projection of $\hat{\boldsymbol{T}}(d,r,k,p)$ to the first bit.

There are two notational conventions. With $\hat{\boldsymbol{T}}$ we denote 9-type trees, while $\boldsymbol{T}_t$ indicates a tree whose labels were created bottom-up. Finally, we have two more trees which allow us in a sense to transition between the top-down and the bottom-up trees.

Table 3. Transition Trees

Tree name	Types	Further description
$\boldsymbol{T}^*(d,r,k)$	$\{0,1\}$	Labels created top-down, mimic the upwards messages $\mu_{x\uparrow}$.
$\hat{\boldsymbol{T}}^*(d,r,k)$	$\{000,001,010,110,111\}$	Obtained from $\boldsymbol{T}^*(d,r,k)$ according to the rules (4.10)-(4.13).

Lemma 4.5 says that $\hat{\boldsymbol{T}}^*(d,r,k)$ has the same distribution as $\hat{\boldsymbol{T}}(d,r,k,p^*)$.

We define various probability distributions and their corresponding laws in the paper. We include some equivalences which are not part of the definitions, but which we prove during the paper. As before, we use the shorthand $F_{\boldsymbol{H}} = \boldsymbol{F}$.

TABLE 4. Distributions in $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{F})$, resp. $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{F}_{\{0,1\}})$

Distribution	Definition	Description
λ_F	$\frac{1}{\lvert\mathcal{V}(F)\rvert}\sum_{v\in\mathcal{V}(F)}\delta_{[F_v,v]}$	distribution of neighbourhoods of variable nodes in F.
$\lambda_{k,F}$	$\frac{1}{\lvert\mathcal{V}(F)\rvert}\sum_{v\in\mathcal{V}(F)}\delta_{[F_v,v,\sigma_{k,F_v}]}$	nodes labelled according to membership of the core.
$\lambda_{k,F,t}$	$\frac{1}{\lvert\mathcal{V}(F)\rvert}\sum_{v\in\mathcal{V}(F)}\delta_{[F_v,v,\mu_\cdot(t\lvert F_v)]}$	vertices labelled after t rounds of WP.

TABLE 5. Distributions in $\mathcal{P}^2(\mathcal{F})$, resp. $\mathcal{P}^2(\mathcal{F}_{\{0,1\}})$

Distribution	Definition	Description
$\Lambda_{d,r,n}$	$\mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{F}}[\delta_{\lambda_{\boldsymbol{F}}}]$	distribution of neighbourhoods of the random factor graph (2.1).
$\Lambda_{d,r,k,n}$	$\mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{F}}[\delta_{\lambda_{k,\boldsymbol{F}}}]$	vertices labelled according to membership of the core (1.4).
$\Lambda_{d,r,k,n,t}$	$\mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{F}}[\lambda_{k,\boldsymbol{F},t}]$	vertices labelled after t rounds of WP (3.7).
$\Lambda_{d,r,k}$	$\lim_{n\to\infty}\Lambda_{d,r,k,n}$	limiting labelled neighbourhood distribution of the random hypergraph.

TABLE 6. Distribution laws

Distribution Law	Definition	Remarks
$\vartheta_{d,r,k,p}$	$\mathcal{L}[\boldsymbol{T}(d,r,k,p)]$	
$\theta_{d,r,k}$	$\lim_{t\to\infty}\mathcal{L}[\boldsymbol{T}_t(d,r,k)]$	$=\vartheta_{d,r,k,p^*}$ (Proposition 3.3, Theorem 1.2).
$\theta^s_{d,r,k,t}$	$\mathcal{L}(\partial^s[\boldsymbol{T}(d,r),v_0,\mu_{\cdot\uparrow}(t\lvert\boldsymbol{T}(d,r))])$	
$\theta^{s,*}_{d,r,k}$	$\mathcal{L}(\partial^s[\boldsymbol{T}(d,r),v_0,\mu^*_{\cdot\uparrow}(s\lvert\boldsymbol{T}(d,r),s)])$	$=\lim_{t\to\infty}\theta^s_{d,r,k,t}=\mathcal{L}(\partial^s[\boldsymbol{T}^*(d,r,k)])$

References

[1] D. Achlioptas, A. Coja-Oghlan, *Algorithmic barriers from phase transitions*, Proc. 49th FOCS (2008), pp. 793–802.

[2] D. Achlioptas, M. Molloy, *The solution space geometry of random linear equations*, Random Structures & Algorithms, 46 (2015), pp. 197–231.

[3] D. Aldous , J. Steele, *The objective method: probabilistic combinatorial optimization and local weak convergence*, In: H. Kesten (ed.): Probability on discrete structures, Springer, 2004.

[4] M. Behrisch, A. Coja-Oghlan, M. Kang, *The order of the giant component of random hypergraphs* Random Structures & Algorithms, 36 (2010), pp. 149–184.

[5] M. Behrisch, A. Coja-Oghlan, M. Kang, *Local limit theorems and number of connected hypergraphs*, arXiv:0706.0497 (2007).

[6] I. Benjamini, O. Schramm, *Recurrence of distributional limits of finite planar graphs*, Electron. J. Probab., 6 (2001), pp. 1–13.

[7] B. Bollobás, *Random graphs*, 2nd ed. (2001), Cambridge Univ. Press.

[8] C.Bordenave, P. Caputo, *Large deviations of empirical neighborhood distribution in sparse random graphs*, arXiv:1308.5725 (2013).

[9] F. Botelho, N. Wormald, N. Nivio, *Cores of random r-partite hypergraphs*, Informa. Process. Lett., 112 (2012), pp. 314–319.

[10] J. Cain, N. Wormald, *Encores on cores*, Electron. J. Combin., 13 (2006) R81.

[11] A. Coja-Oghlan, O. Cooley, M. Kang, K. Skubch, *How does the core sit inside the mantle?*, arXiv:1503.09030 (2015).

[12] C. Cooper, *The cores of random hypergraphs with a given degree sequence*, Random Structures & Algorithms, 25 (2004), pp. 353–375.

[13] R. Darling, J. Norris, *Differential equation approximations for Markov chains*, Probab. Surv., 5 (2008), pp. 37–79.

[14] A. Dembo, A. Montanari, *Finite size scaling for the core of large random hypergraphs*, Ann. Appl. Probab., 18 (2008), pp. 1993–2040.

[15] P. Erdős, A. Rényi, *On the evolution of random graphs*, Magayar Tud. Akad. Mat. Kutato Int. Kozl., 5 (1960), pp 17–61.

[16] S. Janson, M. Luczak, *A simple solution to the k-core problem*, Random Structures & Algorithms, 30 (2007), pp. 50–62.

[17] S. Janson, T.Łuczak, *Random Graphs*, Wiley, 2000.

[18] R. Karp, *The transitive closure of a random digraph*, Random Structures & Algorithms, 1 (1990), pp. 73–93.

[19] J. H. Kim, *Poisson cloning model for random graphs*, Proceedings of the International Congress of Mathematicians, 2006, pp. 873–897.

[20] E. Maneva, E. Mossel, M. Wainwright, *A new look at survey propagation and its generalizations*, J. ACM, 54 (2007).

[21] M. Mézard, A. Montanari, *Information, physics and computation*, Oxford Univ. Press, 2009.

[22] M. Molloy, *Cores in random hypergraphs and Boolean formulas*, Random Structures & Algorithms, 27 (2005), pp. 124–135.

[23] M. Molloy, *The freezing threshold for k-colourings of a random graph*, Proc. 43rd STOC, 2012, pp. 921–930.

[24] M. Molloy, R. Restrepo, *Frozen variables in random boolean constraint satisfaction problems*, Proc. 24th ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, 2013, pp. 1306–1318.

[25] B. Pittel, J. Spencer, N. Wormald, *Sudden emergence of a giant k-core in a random graph*, Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series B, 67 (1996), pp. 111–151

[26] O. Riordan, *The k-core and branching processes*, Combin. Probab. Comput., 17 (2008), pp. 111–136.

[27] J. Schmidt-Pruzan, E. Shamir, *Component structure in the evolution of random hypergraphs*, Combinatorica, 5 (1985), pp. 81–94.